2012

Shared spaces, separate lives: Community formation in the California citrus industry during the great depression

David Gregory Shanta

SHARED SPACES, SEPARATE LIVES: COMMUNITY FORMATION IN THE CALIFORNIA CITRUS INDUSTRY DURING THE GREAT DEPRESSION

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

in

Social Sciences

---

by

David Gregory Shanta

December 2012

SHARED SPACES, SEPARATE LIVES: COMMUNITY FORMATION IN THE CALIFORNIA CITRUS INDUSTRY DURING THE GREAT DEPRESSION

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

---

by

David Gregory Shanta

December 2012

Approved by:

[redacted]

Cherstin M. Lyon, Chair, History

11/19/12
Date

[redacted]

Richard A. Samuelson

[redacted]

Timothy E. Pytell

ABSTRACT

The California citrus industry was the engine for the economic and cultural development of twentieth century Southern California. Studies have also focused on citrus as specialty crop agriculture. Its labor usage pattern required the economic, social, and political powerlessness of its workers. Growers and workers shared the spaces of the citrus groves and packinghouses, but otherwise led largely separate lives, delineated by class and race. Community formation during the Great Depression is examined from each perspective – dominant "Anglo" grower society and workers of Mexican descent.

Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* provides a cultural anthropological framework, in which community forming processes of the separate groups are examined. This thesis aims to contribute to the literature by focusing where possible on the experiences of the small landholding "ranchers," who collectively held the power of large landholders, and on the experiences of Mexican workers, who despite marginalization, pooled their economic and social resources, and persisted in place.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The process of conceiving, researching, and writing this thesis has been a wonderful learning experience, and throughout this process, I have relied on, and benefited greatly from, the knowledge and support of my advisors. Dr. Richard Samuelson exemplified the high standards of scholarship that I have endeavored to reach. I would also like to thank Dr. Joyce Hanson for her generous encouragement through the inevitable challenges of completing a project such as this, and for sharing her enthusiasm and love of history. Dr. Timothy Pytell informed me that this would be a "transformative process," which proved to be an understatement, and I am most grateful for his encouragement of my candidacy in this program.

I owe a special debt of gratitude to my committee chair, Dr. Cherstin Lyon, for the countless hours that she devoted to mentoring my work, insisting on more focused research, clearer thinking, and better writing. In the process, she provided insight into the noble profession of historian and teacher.

I am immensely grateful to the dedicated archivists at A.K. Smiley Library in Redlands, Riverside Public Library, Corona Public Library, and to the archivists in special

collections at Honnold/Mudd Library, Claremont University, Tomas Rivera Library, University of California Riverside, and the Young Research Library, University of California Los Angeles.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION

To my father George Shanta, who passed his love of American history to me; and to my mother, Madeline Petro Shanta, for her unconditional love and support.

INTRODUCTION

On May 5, 1933, the City of Riverside hosted what the *California Citrograph* called a "magnificent spectacle," a day of celebration honoring the sixtieth anniversary of the planting of the "parent" navel orange trees by Mrs. Eliza Tibbets.[1] The main events of the day were a parade followed by a formal dinner for 300 growers and guests at the Mission Inn.

The parade stretched for two miles and was comprised of over 130 decorated floats, many of which used citrus fruit as the main decorating material.[2] The floats represented citrus packinghouses from localities around Southern California, as well as businesses connected to the prosperity of the citrus industry. The two largest cooperatives also paraded floats: the California Fruit Growers Exchange (CFGE, later Sunkist), and Mutual Orange Distributors (MOD, later Pure Gold). As it happened, the

---

[1] Walter Reuther, Herbert John Webber, Leon Dexter Batchelor, eds. *The Citrus Industry, Vol.1: History, World Distribution, Botany and Varieties*, Rev. ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), 484-85. The term "parent" navel orange trees derives from the practice of budding, in which a cutting from a parent tree is grafted onto a suitable rootstock. According to Reuther, et al, millions of navel trees in California traced their lineage to these first trees grown in the Tibbets' yard.

[2] "Riverside Pays Spectacular Homage to Mrs. Eliza Tibbets," *California Citrograph*, June 1933, 217.

CFGE was celebrating their fortieth anniversary in 1933, and so their Sunkist brand was emblazoned on a large birthday cake. One float depicted Eliza Tibbets planting the parent navels, while another showed her watering them with her dishwater, according to the legend. A stagecoach delivered two navel trees, in a reenactment of their actual arrival sixty years before.[3] The floats were rolling displays of civic pride in hometown citrus groves, and a sort of passing in review of the established economic and social order.

Community, hierarchies and local culture become established by such events. Historian David Glassberg calls historical pageants dramatic public rituals, chronicling local community development. This historical imagery is controlled by economic and political power, thus the dominant culture tells the story. The historical imagery of Eliza Tibbets, as matriarchal pioneer, provides a starting point in an idealized past, leading to prosperity in the present (1933), thus providing context within which to

---

[3] "Floats Make Hit in Parade," *Riverside Daily Press*, May 6, 1933.

shape and interpret future experiences.[4] The day's events were intended to reinforce and celebrate the sense of community among growers across Southern California.

A special day, set aside to honor a mythical founding event such as this one, is often attended by ritual and ceremony. A formal dinner was held at the Mission Inn that evening, and was attended by prominent growers, leaders of the various cooperatives, railroad executives, state and federal officials, and foreign dignitaries. The Brazilian consul was among those dignitaries, in recognition of his country's Bahia district, which was the origin for Riverside's navel orange trees.[5]

The Orange Day celebration dinner was served in a room adorned with baskets of oranges and orange blossoms, and naturally, navel orange juice and orange-based dishes were served with the roast turkey. After dinner a brief talk on the origins of those parent navel orange trees was delivered by A.D. Shamel, Plant Physiologist for the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Shamel further stated that

---

[4] David Glassberg, *American Historical Pageantry* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990).

[5] "Brilliant Banquet at Inn Is Closing Event of 'Orange Day' Celebration," *Riverside Daily Press*, May 6, 1933; Reuther, et al., *The Citrus Industry*, 484-485.

300,000 acres were at that time planted in citrus in California, and he estimated that the industry had returned over $750 million to the state over the last sixty years.[6] A brief congratulatory note from Secretary of Agriculture Henry Wallace was also read. His statement reinforced the partnership between government, science, and private enterprise that together had wrought the success of the industry, and its shared benefits to society.[7]

The economies of Riverside and San Bernardino counties were built on this foundation of citrus cultivation. The idea of citrus as a farming pursuit seemed idyllic, working and living among the beautiful and fragrant trees. But just beneath these outward appearances, was the hard reality of the citrus business, for both growers and workers. For example, before the cooperatives were formed in the early 1890s, the growers had little control over the chaotic markets into which they shipped

---

[6] Ronald Tobey and Charles Wetherell, "The Citrus Industry and the Revolution of Corporate Capitalism in Southern California, 1887-1944," *California History* 74, no.1 (Spring 1995): 6-21; Tobey and Wetherell calculated that citrus income from 1887 to 1944 contributed $3.6 billion to California in direct receipts, and estimated another $800 million spent in the state during this period, to build, maintain, and man the railroad infrastructure.

[7] "Story of How Navel Orange Originated in Brazil is Told," *Riverside Daily Press*, May 6, 1933.

their fruit, and they were facing ruin.[8] Survival meant taking control of all aspects of the business: cooperative ownership of the packinghouses and locating their own sales and marketing organization in major U.S. cities and in foreign ports.[9] The cooperatives also facilitated collective control of labor, which was essential to the success of any specialty crop. The cooperative organization became a form of real community for the growers, based on their joint business venture. Cultural institutions like the Orange Day celebration or the CFGE organ *California Citrograph*, created the comradeship of imagined community.

Citrus ranching was but one form of specialty crop agriculture, which is characterized by a more intensive use per acre, of capital, irrigation, scientific methods, and cheap labor, than the extensive farming of staple crops such as wheat. In this system, labor bore the brunt of cost control, as the other factors were either fixed in cost or under external control. Large-scale farming lowered costs

---

[8] P.J. Dreher, "Early History of Cooperative Marketing of Citrus Fruit," *California Citrograph*, October 1916, 2.

[9] Grace Larsen and H. E. Erdman, "Development of Revolving Finance in Sunkist Growers," *Journal of Farm Economics* 41, no. 4 (November 1959): 769-780.

through mechanization; specialty crop growers were constantly occupied with obtaining and keeping sources of low-cost labor. Despite periodic efforts to bring white workers (as potential small farmers and agrarian stalwarts) to California's fields,[10] immigrant labor filled shortfalls, and eventually became the primary source of farm labor.

Large-scale farming was at odds with traditional agrarian values, but entirely consistent with industrial processes such as extraction, mechanization, and the use of labor that is not attached to the land, but who report to the fields each morning like factory workers. Ironically, the fears that agrarians had about large-scale grain farming being injurious to the social fabric, diminished as mechanization reduced the hands needed to till, cultivate and harvest; such fears were then transferred to specialty crop agriculture, and its use of migratory labor, unattached to the land. The worker became more of an expendable cog than productive partner.[11] In *Bitter Harvest,* Cletus Daniel asserts that no matter the race or

---

[10] Cletus Daniel, *Bitter Harvest: A History of California Farmworkers, 1870-1941,* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981), 55-59.

[11] Daniel, *Bitter Harvest,* 69.

nation of origin, California growers sought and shaped a work force that was economically, politically, and socially powerless, and had convinced themselves that their own economic survival depended on such powerlessness. In the early twentieth century, Mexican immigrant as well as Mexican American workers were considered desirable for their (perceived) willingness to fill this role.[12]

Exclusion from the dominant society resulted in limited choices for these workers and their families.[13] Segregation and discrimination were daily realities for Mexican immigrants, yet they were willing and able to create a sense of community in the spaces left to them. Within these spaces of home, neighborhood, church, leisure activities, and work, bonds were formed based on family, cultural commonalities, and economic class. The pageantry

---

[12] Daniel, 67; David Vaught, *Cultivating California: Growers, Specialty Crops, and Labor, 1875-1920* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1999), 184.

[13] Gilbert G. Gonzalez, *Labor and Community: Mexican Citrus Worker Villages in a Southern California County, 1900-1950* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994); Vicki L. Ruiz, *From Out of the Shadows: Mexican Women in Twentieth Century America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998); Matt Garcia, *A World of its Own: Race, Labor and Citrus in the Making of Greater Los Angeles, 1900-1970* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001); Jose M. Alamillo, *Making Lemonade Out of Lemons: Mexican American Labor and Leisure in a California Town, 1880-1960* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press: 2006).

of the Orange Day celebration in Riverside contrasts sharply with the scale of a community celebration in the workers' neighborhood, given in honor of a family event such as a wedding or a birthday.[14]

The growers and workers shared the spaces of the groves and the packinghouses, but for the most part, they led separate lives. In their own ways, each group was involved in community formation, which will be the subject of this thesis.

Benedict Anderson's work, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*[15] provided a theoretical basis for this study of the parallel formation of communities of growers and workers. Anderson defines a *nation* as an imagined political community, but elements of his theory can be applied to the communities of citrus growers and citrus workers. Anderson states "all communities larger than primordial villages of face-to-face contact (and perhaps even these) are imagined." They are imagined because most members will never know most of their

---

[14] Gilbert G. Gonzalez, *Labor and Community: Mexican Citrus Worker Villages in a Southern California County, 1900-1950* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994), 91.

[15] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. rev. ed. (London: Verson, 1991).

fellows, "yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion."[16] Community is conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship, despite inequalities and inequities. Nationalism arises from this sense of community. It is not deterred by ideology, nor is it an ideology. Anderson insists that this sense of fraternity that makes community possible also inspires a willingness to die for the nation. Such sacrifice for the imagined community is deeply rooted in (perceived) ancient culture.[17] Anderson's work is a study of how peoples build nations after colonization. The groups studied in this work did not aspire to nationhood, and their pathways to community differed, but the objectives of growers and workers to overcome external threats were each achieved by drawing strength from their belief in the justice of their common cause.

This thesis then, seeks to add to our understanding of why each group formed communities as they did, the ways in which they did it, and how their pre-existing values formed their perceptions of themselves as well as their

---

[16] Anderson, *Imagined Coomuities*, 6.

[17] Anderson, 7. Anderson describes the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier as a cenotaph, that is, representative of all American dead from all of our nation's wars; hence there is a perceived ancient connection for all Americans to those dead, reaching back to the Revolutionary War.

perceptions of the other group. The growers' self-image as gentlemen farmers[18] and the perceptions that they formed of the Mexican workers often engendered a paternalistic approach in their interactions with their workers. Growers hoped that the stability of year-round work in the groves would offset the temptation for the workers to look for better pay elsewhere. Perceptions of the Mexican workers by the larger community also predicted the treatment that they received, as a marginalized ethnic minority.[19] In turn, these experiences shaped the perceptions held by the workers about their economic prospects and the lack of social acceptance within the greater community. Disappointment became bitterness, and tempered the expectations of life in America for a Mexican immigrant or even for an American of Mexican descent.

Historiography

California's citrus industry has drawn continued attention from historians, well beyond its halcyon days as

---

[18] Kevin Starr, *Inventing The Dream: California Through the Progressive Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 140-44.

[19] Matt Garcia, *A World of its Own: Race, Labor and Citrus in the Making of Greater Los Angeles, 1900-1970* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001).

the primary export product of the state, in the 1930s. Focusing on the exploitation of migrant workers has been ongoing since Carey McWilliams' *Factories in the Fields* was published in 1939. In that same year, University of California economist Paul S. Taylor testified before the LaFollette Committee, a Senate subcommittee investigating California farm labor disputes.[20] During the 1930s, Taylor and his wife, photographer Dorothea Lange, investigated and documented many of California's violent farm labor strikes for government agencies, including the 1933 cotton strike.[21] In his testimony, Taylor asked what Vaught called "the defining question of the hearings and of his [Taylor's] career: 'Can a large farm labor class be reconciled with democracy?'"[22] The answer was "no," when labor usage in this system caused unemployment that is "intermittent and severe," creating a permanent underclass of migrants,

---

[20] Carey McWilliams, *Factories in the Field: The Story of Migratory Farm Labor in California* (Santa Barbara: Peregrine, 1971); Paul S. Taylor was a prolific writer on farm labor in California. For a brief but insightful summary of both the LaFollette hearings and California's peculiar agricultural history, see Paul S. Taylor "California Farm Labor: A Review," *Agricultural History* 42, no. 1 (Jan., 1968): 49-54; also, Paul S. Taylor, "Foundations of California Rural Society," *California Historical Society Quarterly* 24, no. 3 (Sep., 1945): 193-22.

[21] David Vaught, *Cultivating California: Growers, Specialty Crops, and Labor, 1875-1920* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1999), 6-7.

[22] Vaught, 6-7.

working only for subsistence.[23] These two events, McWilliams' book and Taylor's testimony, focused the national spotlight on California's farm labor troubles.

In recent decades, scholars have devoted their efforts toward two primary ends: first, determining whether the citrus industry was prototypical of a new industrialized form of agriculture, what industrialized means in an agricultural context, and its historic origins; second, studying the experiences of immigrant and migrant labor groups, and pushing beyond worker powerlessness and misery, by also documenting the agency which they exercised in their lives at home, in the community, and where possible, in the workplace.

Histories of the citrus industry in California tend to focus on the economic impact of the industry, and on the large landholding growers.[24] Recent studies of citrus labor are concerned with community formation among the workers in their villages. These histories touch on growers, but do

---

[23] Vaught, 6-7.

[24] Examples are Anthea Marie Hartig, "Citrus growers and the construction of the Southern California landscape, 1880-1940" (PhD diss., University of California, Riverside, 2001), and Michael R. Belknap, "The Era of the Lemon: A History of Santa Paula, California." *California Historical Society Quarterly* 47, no.2 (June, 1968): 113-140.

not study grower community formation among the small ranchers. This thesis will begin to add to the literature by studying community formation in this specific socio-economic group.

The California Gold Rush prompted a rapid influx of Americans and immigrants, and with it, a rapid increase in demand for food. Many historians and economists see the response to this event as setting the pattern of farming as a business, and labor as a unit of production, a cost to be controlled. James Gerber[25] writes about the wheat and barley growers, whose rapid expansion of production produced a turnaround in which California went from importer to exporter of grains in the space of five years. They were able to accomplish this in a tight labor market, by exploiting Native Americans as the first source of cheap labor for California farmers.[26]

---

[25] James Gerber, "The Gold Rush Origins of California's Wheat Economy," *America Latina En La Historia Economica*, Boletin De Fuentes 34 (December, 2010): 35-64; and James Gerber, "The Origin of California's Export Surplus in Cereals," *Agricultural History* 67, no. 4 (Autumn, 1993): 40-57.

[26] For a treatment of the transition from extensive to intensive farming in the period 1878-1929, see Alan L. Olmstead and Paul W. Rhode, "The Evolution of California Agriculture, 1850-2000," in *California Agriculture: Dimensions and Issues*, ed. Jerome B. Seibert (University of California Press, 2004), 1-28; also Paul W. Rhode, "Learning, Capital Accumulation, and the Transformation of California Agriculture," *Journal of Economic History* 55, no. 4 (Dec., 1995): 773-

Agrarians believed that large landholdings and the concomitant need for a class of migrant labor was a threat to democracy, and saw smaller family farms as distributing economic and political power. That redistribution did not occur in grain farming, rather the labor issue diminished as mechanization replaced hands in the field. Ironically, the transition from extensive (grains) to intensive farming (specialty crops) meant that more hands were needed per acre. Therefore, the intensive farming methods of specialty crop agriculture extended the pattern of seasonal use of workers who were unattached to the land.

Cletus Daniel and David Vaught both examine the conflict between the profit demands in California's specialty crop agriculture and the agrarian ideal. Daniel roots it in the continuation of the pattern of large-scale land ownership from the Spanish-Mexican era, and the same "single-minded, get-rich-quick orientation"[27] of bonanza wheat farms, copying the mentality of gold miners. Vaught's

---

800; for the complete text of *An Act for the Government and Protection of Indians, 1850,* see Robert Heizer, ed., *The Destruction of California Indians: a collection of documents from the period 1847-1865, in which are described some of the things that happened to some of the Indians of California* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1993), 219-226.

[27] Cletus Daniel, *Bitter Harvest: A History of California Farmworkers, 1870-1941,* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981), 21.

objective is to view history from the perspective of the growers, whom he believes have been less represented or misrepresented in recent, labor-oriented histories. Vaught presents specialty crop growers as neither Jeffersonian agrarians, nor amoral industrialists, fixated on profits. They saw themselves as horticulturalists,[28] and believed that they were improving the nutrition of the nation.[29]

Citrus growers will be examined as both horticulturalists *and* as inheritors of the legacy of the bonanza wheat farmers. The cooperatives enabled the small ranchers to appear as family farmers in the traditional sense, while giving them collective control of labor in a manner consistent with large landholders. The citrus industry in Southern California developed in such a way that it facilitated a more settled life for citrus workers. This created a demand for year round labor, allowing workers to seek permanent housing. That it did so however, was incidental to its primary goal of situating different

---

[28]Merriam-Webster defines horticulture as "the science and art of growing fruits, vegetables, flowers, or ornamental plants." The root word, *hortus*, is Latin for garden.

[29] David Vaught, *Cultivating California: Growers, Specialty Crops, and Labor, 1875-1920* (John Hopkins University Press, 1999).

varieties of citrus where they would maximize crop yields and profits.[30] At the same time, the growers took pride, as horticulturalists, in growing fruit that was good tasting and good for you, and which, once considered a luxury, had come to be considered a staple in a healthy diet.[31]

Tobey and Wetherell contended that the citrus industry was the foundation industry in Southern California, the engine of growth and development. It formed linkages with the industrialized northeast and Midwest, just as the South had done with cotton. What's more, Tobey and Wetherell, and Vincent Moses, believed that the California Fruit Growers Exchange was organized along the lines of managerial capitalism, and operated as an industrial enterprise, not agricultural in the traditional sense. Their contention was based on CFGE's vertical integration, its interlocking

---

[30] Summer-ripening Valencia oranges were concentrated along the coastal plains, where loss to freezes were less likely; winter-harvested navels were planted in the hot inland valleys, where their yields could be maximized; lemons were planted in both coastal and inland locations.

[31] For histories of and relating to citrus fruit, see Walter Reuther, Herbert John Webber, Leon Dexter Batchelor eds. *The Citrus Industry, Vol.1: History, World Distribution, Botany and Varieties*, Rev. ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967); Erich Isaac, "Influence of Religion on the Spread of Citrus." *Science* 129, no. 3343 (Jan. 23, 1959): 179-186; Laszlo, Pierre. *Citrus: A History.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007; Charles C. Teague, *Fifty Years A Rancher* (Los Angeles: Anderson & Ritchie, The Ward Ritchie Press, 1944).

partnerships with government and scientific resources, and its perpetual need for a source of cheap labor.[32]

Whether they were agricultural barons or industrial barons, some of Riverside's wealthiest growers were featured in a series of photographic essays, published from 1928 to 1937 in the *California Citrograph*, organ of the CFGE. The essays are the basis for a study by Anthea Hartig, which analyzes growers' homes, citrus groves, labor housing, and the greater community, as cultural landscape. These reinforced class structure and codes of behavior that were "critical to the maintenance of collective class cohesion and continued economic return."[33] Although Hartig's

---

[32] Ronald Tobey and Charles Wetherell, "The Citrus Industry and the Revolution of Corporate Capitalism in Southern California, 1887-1944," *California History* 74, no. 1 (Spring, 1995): 6-21; H. Vincent Moses, "'The Orange-Grower Is Not a Farmer': G. Harold Powell, Riverside Orchardists, and the Coming of Industrial Agriculture, 1893-1930," *California History* 74, no. 1(Spring, 1995): 22-37; for an opposing view, see Grace H. Larsen, "Commentary: The Economics and Structure of the Citrus Industry: Comment on Papers by H. Vincent Moses and Ronald Tobey and Charles Wetherell," *California History* 74, no. 1(Spring, 1995): 38-45; for insight into the CFGE organization, Grace Larsen and H. E. Erdman, "Development of Revolving Finance in Sunkist Growers," *Journal of Farm Economics* 41, no. 4 (November 1959): 769-780; see also Rahno Mabel MacCurdy, V.A. Lockebey, and others, *Selling The Gold: History of Sunkist and Pure Gold*. Upland, CA: The Upland Public Library Foundation, 1999.

[33] Anthea M. Hartig, "'In a World He Has Created': Class Collectivity and the Growers' Landscape of the Southern California Citrus Industry, 1890-1940" *California History* 74, no. 1 Citriculture and Southern California (Spring 1995): 100-111; see also Anthea Marie Hartig, "Citrus growers and the construction of the Southern California landscape, 1880-1940" (PhD diss., University of California, Riverside, 2001).

subjects were the grower elite, cultural landscapes were also shaped by communities of small growers, and by Mexican workers in their villages.

Citrus industry labor, long neglected, now offers an extensive array of perspectives. Immigration and immigrant issues are inextricably bound up with the various groups that have toiled in the citrus groves, from the late nineteenth century onward. Mario T. Garcia chronicles the immigration of large numbers of Mexicans through El Paso, where they made their first attempts to enter American economic life. In El Paso, they learned to negotiate the realities of segregation and exploitation, but also had their first experiences forming communities in the United States.[34]

There is a correlation between the labor struggles in the cotton fields of the San Joaquin Valley and those in

---

[34] Mario T. Garcia, *Desert Immigrants: The Mexicans of El Paso, 1880-1920* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981); also Emilio Zamora, *The World of the Mexican Worker in Texas* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1993) and Vicki L. Ruiz, *From Out of the Shadows: Mexican Women in Twentieth Century America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998); for a comprehensive study of the experiences of Chinese immigrants in agriculture, see Sucheng Chan, *This Bittersweet Soil: The Chinese in California Agriculture, 1860-1910* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986); also Mae M. Ngai, *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.

the citrus groves of Orange County and Corona, and it can be found in the activist background of Mexican workers.[35] Many of these workers had experienced the trauma of having their *ejidos* (communal farms) expropriated by expanding haciendas, despite widespread peasant revolts. They had been organizing since the 1860s to also fight industrial exploitation. For many, the Mexican Revolution of 1910-1920 was the culminating event that forced them to emigrate. The response of California growers to this labor activism was punitive, comprehensive, and consistent, across geographic and industry lines. The same tactics were used to suppress organizing in both the cotton fields and the orange groves. The Associated Farmers came into being after the 1933 cotton strike, and in 1936 they played a major role in the battle against Mexican citrus workers in Orange County.[36]

---

[35] Devra Weber, *Dark Sweat, White Gold: California Farm Workers, Cotton, and the New Deal* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994), 83-85.

[36] See also Nelson A. Pichardo, "The Power Elite and Elite-Driven Counter-movements: The Associated Farmers of California during the 1930s," *Sociological Forum* 10, no.1 (March 1995): 21-49; also Kevin Starr, *Endangered Dreams: The Great Depression in California* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996); T.H. Watkins, *The Hungry Years: A Narrative History of the Great Depression In America* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1999); Mark Arax and Rick Wartzman, *The King of California: J.G. Boswell and the Making of a Secret American Empire* (New York: Public Affairs).

Despite the hazards associated with immigration, the Depression, labor-capital conflict, and even the threat of deportation, the Mexican citrus workers found ways to exercise their own choices, or agency, in life in their California villages. Gilbert Gonzalez, Matt Garcia and Jose Alamillo reconstruct the communities formed in the villages of Orange County, the San Gabriel Valley, and Corona, respectively. Each placed emphasis on the networks of support found in family events, churches, social clubs, sports teams, *Cinco de Mayo* celebrations, mutual aid societies, and through cultural venues like theater and music. What Alamillo calls community building is described by Garcia as building counter-hegemonic alliances, while dwelling inside, rather than transcending the dominant culture.[37]

Margo McBane's case study of the role of gender in employment at the Limoneira Ranch in Ventura County contributes valuable insights into the role that women (and

---

[37] Gilbert G. Gonzalez, *Labor and Community: Mexican Citrus Worker Villages in a Southern California County, 1900-1950* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994); Matt Garcia, *A World of its Own: Race, Labor and Citrus in the Making of Greater Los Angeles, 1900-1970* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001); Jose M. Alamillo, *Making Lemonade Out of Lemons: Mexican American Labor and Leisure in a California Town, 1880-1960* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press: 2006).

children) played in the system of labor control that was exerted by growers, for instance through the "lure" of housing.[38] Gilbert Gonzalez focuses on the day-to-day contributions that Mexican women made to worker village life, and the sacrifices they made to keep body and soul together in their families.[39]

Histories of the citrus industry in California describe a highly organized, if not industrialized type of agriculture, and use the practices of the large ranches as their model. Stephanie McCurry identified a similar need to study small landholders and their labor relations in the antebellum South, where most historians used the large plantations as their models.[40] The small acreage citrus growers had the same comprehensive labor control as the large ranches. The cooperatives made this control of citrus

---

[38] Margo McBane, "The Role of Gender in Citrus Employment: A Case Study of Recruitment, Labor, and Housing Patterns at the Limoneira Company, 1893 to 1940," *California History* 74, no. 1, Citriculture and Southern California (Spring, 1995): 68-81; for a comprehensive history of the Limoneira Ranch and the integration of it and the town of Santa Paula, see also Michael R. Belknap, "The Era of the Lemon: A History of Santa Paula, California." *California Historical Society Quarterly* 47, no.2 (June, 1968): 113-140.

[39] Gilbert G. Gonzalez, "Women, Work, and Community in the Mexican Colonias of the Southern California Citrus Belt," *California History* 74, no. 1, Citriculture and Southern California (Spring, 1995): 58-67.

[40] Stephanie McCurry, *Masters of Small Worlds: Yeoman Households, Gender Relations, & the Political Culture of the Antebellum South Carolina Low Country* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

workers possible, and they bear responsibility for the treatment that their workers received. This thesis aims to contribute to the literature by focusing wherever possible on the experiences of the small landholding ranchers, who were the numerical majorities in the local cooperative fruit exchanges. Their sheer numbers made real and imagined communities possible.

Methodology

In order to test whether and to what extent Benedict Anderson's theory in *Imagined Communities* can be applied to the citrus industry and its growers and workers, we should first identify Anderson's methodology. He submits his definition of community "in an anthropological spirit."[41] Community is based on ancient cultural roots, therefore it can be stated that his study of community is a cultural anthropological construct. Imagined community requires the vernacularization of language, and mass communication through that vernacular. When technology (the printing press) combined with a cultural content (Luther's Theses), and the capitalist impulse, Luther's theses spread rapidly

---

[41] Anderson, 5-6.

and the Protestant Reformation succeeded. The imagined community of Protestants was created by mass communication. Printing presses spread rapidly in English North America during the eighteenth century, when the printers discovered that there was money to be made selling newspapers. Once again, mass communication combined with a political cause to unite the colonists through their imagined community.[42] Their "American-ness" was a cultural artifact, based on ancient cultural roots. Vernacularization created a capitalist opportunity, and the capitalist impulse in turn drove vernacularization.[43] Anderson's methodology was to use cultural institutions such as newspapers, which reflected daily life in an imagined community.

This study will present myriad ways that growers and workers sent and received signals of commonality. For example, growers with varying sizes of groves, and from distant locales, read the monthly trade journals of the growers' cooperatives. They understood that while they may never meet, there still existed a feeling of comradeship

---

[42] Anderson, 61.

[43] Anderson, 33. Anderson notes that between 1455 when Gutenberg printed his first Bible, and 1500, more than twenty million copies had already been printed.

with their fellow growers in the citrus producing parts of the state. Mexican immigrant workers may have found such commonalities in Spanish language newspapers, or through Spanish-language radio broadcasts. The Southwestern migrant workers, who stayed in Farm Security Administration camps in the cotton country of the San Joaquin Valley, had their own camp newspapers, open to participation by all. They also exchanged their papers with other camps, expanding imagined community beyond the local camp, to encompass the workers and their families in all FSA camps.[44]

Besides ancient cultural roots and universalized communication, creole elites, and census, map, and museum, are other aspects of Anderson's theory that can be applied to citrus growers and workers in Riverside and San Bernardino counties during the Great Depression. Creole elites refers to leaders of an oppressed, colonized or embattled group, whose consciousness of imagined community awakens them to the possibility of independence. This concept is applied to both growers and workers in Chapter Two. Census, map, and museum are institutions of colonizing power. Applied to citrus grower-worker relations,

---

[44] *Weed Patch Cultivator: Published Weekly In The Arvin Migratory Camp* 1, no.1, September 2, 1938.

serialization (census) took form in the racial segregation of worker housing. By the creation of a cultural landscape, the growers re-mapped the land. Museum refers to a dominant society writing an exclusionary history of the re-mapped land. These methods of evaluating grower-worker relations will be expanded in the Conclusion.

The sources chosen for this thesis will test the applicability of the above theories. Primary sources include newspaper accounts, industry journals, the Redlands Chamber of Commerce collection, and oral histories of growers and workers. Archival records such as census data and Department of Agriculture reports provide hard data that forms an economic context to the human story. In this thesis, I use oral histories by growers and workers to describe the day-to-day impact of this collective labor control of the small ranchers, on community. The growers' focus is shown to be on the bottom line, as can be expected, and that all relations to workers were seen through that prism. Their success, dependent on competent but low-wage workers, maintained their membership in their community of growers and their status in the greater community. The workers' responses to this economic system coupled with social marginalization by the greater

community, was to turn to each other in their villages across the citrus belt.

The goal of this work is to describe separate community formations of growers and workers, immigrant and dominant society, and Mexican and Anglo cultures. It is also to show commonalities in these parallel efforts, and therefore, between these groups.

Definitions and Terminology

The term "Mexican" is frequently seen in the primary and secondary sources and is often applied to both Mexican immigrants and Americans of Mexican descent. Its use is appropriate when we are discussing Mexican cultural commonalities that apply to all persons of Mexican descent. Historians (including those of Mexican descent) frequently use the term for brevity, when it can be implied that the discussion applies to all persons of Mexican descent. The term can also be used with intent to insinuate that regardless of legal status (citizen or resident alien), the social status of these groups remained undifferentiated. This usage was discriminatory in the 1930s, claiming that all persons of Mexican descent were taking jobs and social services that white Americans were entitled to, as a

pretense for Repatriation.[45] In this study, I will distinguish between Mexican immigrants and Mexican Americans wherever necessary, and any use of "Mexican" for brevity should not be interpreted as intent to stereotype *any* person of Mexican descent.

Several terms are used to describe the communities formed by Mexican immigrants and Mexican Americans. Among these are *barrio*, village, *colonia*, and neighborhood. Each has its virtue and its drawback. Gilbert Gonzalez uses village,[46] to distinguish the semi-rural nature of these spaces that were contiguous to citrus towns and groves, as opposed to an urban *barrio,* used extensively when urban landscapes are being discussed.[47] *Colonia* indicates that we are describing a Spanish-speaking enclave, however, it

---

[45] Emilio Zamora, *The World of the Mexican Worker in Texas* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1993), 88.

[46] Gilbert G. Gonzalez, "Labor and Community: The Camps of Mexican Citrus Pickers in Southern California," *Western Historical Quarterly* 22, no. 3 (August, 1991): 290.

[47] Mario T. Garcia, *Desert Immigrants: The Mexicans of El Paso, 1880-1920* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), 4,9, 127-154; Vicki L. Ruiz, *From Out of the Shadows: Mexican Women in Twentieth Century America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 33-45,48; for good measure, Merriam-Webster defines *barrio* as "a Spanish-speaking quarter or neighborhood in a city or town in the United States especially in the Southwest."

connotes a separate entity.[48] Many Mexican workers lived in neighborhoods that were part of a citrus town, like the north side of Redlands. I decided that village implied communal feeling and social arrangement within those neighborhoods, and will be used throughout.

Growers is a generic term describing those engaged in agriculture, although at times, citrus growers liked to refer to themselves also as ranchers - longtime President of the CFGE C.C. Teague, entitled his memoir *Fifty Years a Rancher.*[49] My interpretation is that it romanticizes the growers' self-image and the life that they chose for themselves. Grower is the general class and rancher, in this study, is specific in that it refers to *citrus growers.*

Citriculture is the process of cultivating citrus fruit, a combination of citrus and horticulture or agriculture; citrus culture refers to the idea of living and working in the groves and the towns that came into

---

[48] Matt Garcia, *A World of its Own: Race, Labor and Citrus in the Making of Greater Los Angeles, 1900-1970* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001), 268 (note 1).

[49] Charles C. Teague, *Fifty Years A Rancher* (Los Angeles: Anderson & Ritchie: The Ward Ritchie Press, 1944).

being from citriculture, that is, a way of life.[50] I use the term grove as a more general reference to the places where the trees were planted and nurtured, and where the work took place. It was one of the shared spaces. The term citrus industry contains the entirety of the economic enterprise: growers, workers, the groves, packinghouses, marketing, cooperatives, etc.

Any use of the terms "large" growers or "small" growers, does not refer to the ranch owner's physical stature as a human being, but rather the amount of acreage that he or she owns and has under cultivation. The vast majority of growers owned ranches or groves in the range of ten to fifteen acres. Growers holding larger size ranches had different problems, for example obtaining and supporting the labor force needed to pick the fruit and maintain the groves, as well as providing housing for those workers.

---

[50] Douglas Cazaux Sackman, "By Their Fruits Ye Shall Know Them": "Nature Cross Culture Hybridization" and the California Citrus Industry, 1893-1939, *California History* 74, no. 1 (Spring, 1995): 84.

CHAPTER ONE

CITRUS, CALIFORNIA'S REAL GOLD

From the beginning of the American period in 1848, California agriculture was being transformed by the sharp increase in population due to the Gold Rush, and by the response of American capitalists to seize the opportunities presented by it. Grain acreage increased rapidly to serve this new, local market, and continued to grow until California became a grain exporter. By the time that Eliza Tibbets planted her navel orange trees in 1873, farmers and businessmen, looking for new cash crops, were already planting a variety of fruits and nuts, made possible by the state's diverse soils and climates. These newer entrants were crops that demanded an intensified investment of capital, scientific research to maximize their potential, and a system of labor usage adapted to this new system.[1] California's potential as agricultural powerhouse in the twentieth century originated in this transition from extensive farming of staple crops, to intensive farming of

---

[1] Paul W. Rhode, "Learning, Capital Accumulation, and the Transformation of California Agriculture," *Journal of Economic History* 55, no. 4 (Dec., 1995): 773-800.

special crops. It was specialty crop agriculture that created the image and the reality of California as Golden State. Cultivation of oranges and lemons moved to the forefront of this type of agriculture, in both image and reality,[2] fulfilling the ideas embodied in the 1907 advertising slogan "Oranges for Health, California for Wealth."[3] Behind the image of the Golden State was a system that formed classes based on race or ethnicity, that ultimately formed separate communities of white growers and workers of Asian and Mexican descent. These latter groups were marginalized economically and socially, through segregation, discrimination, and legislation.

The Development of California's Specialty Crop Agriculture

In this chapter, the origins of California's specialty crop agriculture are more fully developed, creating the context for the success of the citrus industry in the

---

[2] Ronald Tobey and Charles Wetherell, "The Citrus Industry and the Revolution of Corporate Capitalism in Southern California, 1887-1944," *California History* 74, no. 1 (Spring, 1995): 6-21. The combined citrus income from the five counties of Ventura, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside and San Bernardino was over $140 million in 1930, greater than the combined total of the area's manufacturing, oil and movie industries.

[3] Kevin Starr, *Inventing The Dream: California Through the Progressive Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 162.

twentieth century. Grower organizations enabled this sustained success, and also became the foundation of community formation among growers. Sustaining their economic successes required grower solidarity and discipline, in order to limit competition in the market, and to keep competition among workers high. The labor usage pattern in specialty crop agriculture is also examined. Specialty crop agriculture became antithetical to the agrarian ideal by creating an underclass of migrant labor. Faced with the hardships of this system, workers had to form temporary communities in the migrant labor camps, where fellow workers became family surrogates. By virtue of year round work, citrus workers in Riverside and San Bernardino counties were able to settle in a permanent home, instead of a tent in a camp. It was an opportunity to form real friendships with neighbors, instead of life on the road. These historical developments set the stage for community formation in both groups, which will be fully presented in the second chapter.

The Gold Rush caused what is normally termed as "de-industrialization,"[4] in which workers abandon industry (or in this case, agriculture), to join a mineral boom. The boom generates wealth that can be used to import food instead of growing it. Therefore, wages for farming must compete with the amount that a worker-turned-miner can earn in gold.[5] If entrepreneurs wanted to invest in wheat and barley production, in order to satisfy the growing local market, cheap labor had to be found. By 1852, the state was self-sufficient in wheat and barley with production still rising, and surplus wheat was exported for the first time in 1855.[6]

At a time when day laborers in the San Francisco area were earning four to five times the wages of their eastern U.S. counterparts, California farmers secured a cheap source of labor by coercive legislation. Indian labor was exploited by paying them below-market wages, and if

---

[4] James Gerber, "The Gold Rush Origins of California's Wheat Economy," *America Latina En La Historia Economica, Boletin De Fuentes* 34 (December, 2010): 37, footnote 3.

[5] Gerber, "Gold Rush Origins," 44-47. Gerber's data shows that the average unskilled worker in the San Francisco Bay area earned wages that were about six times higher than his counterpart in the eastern U.S. until 1853, but was still more than three times higher from 1854 through 1860.

[6] Gerber, 44.

possible, paying "in kind," that is, with grain and other trade goods such as clothing.[7] A life of farm labor was imposed upon the Indian population, through practices such as indenture, and ordinances against vagrancy and public drunkenness. In the law entitled *An Act for the Government and Protection of Indians April 22, 1850,*[8] an Indian who did not have the "wherewithal to maintain himself," or who was loitering or drunk in public was subject to arrest upon the complaint of any "reasonable citizen" (white person). Such a vagrant could be hired for labor by the highest bidder, his work sentence not to exceed four months. The wages, after deductions for housing, clothing and feeding the worker, were sent to his family, or if he had none, paid into the county "Indian Fund." With these methods, grain farmers obtained workers for their commercial operations.[9]

However, by the time the law was repealed in 1863, the use of Indian labor was already declining, commensurate

---

[7] Gerber, 46, 50.

[8] *An Act for the Government and Protection of Indians April 22, 1850,* Chapter 133, *Statutes of California,* April 22, 1850; Chapter 231, *Statutes of California,* April 8, 1860; also Robert Heizer, ed., *The Destruction of California Indians: a collection of documents from the period 1847-1865, in which are described some of the things that happened to some of the Indians of California* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1993), 219-226.

[9] *An Act for the Government and Protection of Indians,* 219-226.

with a significant drop in their numbers statewide. Between 1848 and 1868, the Indian population declined by over eighty percent. In addition to diseases and wanton killings, indenture disrupted the reproduction of their people and of their culture by separating individuals from their villages and families.[10] This system of agriculture contributed to the destruction of, instead of the formation of Native American communities.

The startup of large scale grain farming could not have been as profitable during the gold mining boom, unless the Anglo-American farmers continued the Mexican system of acquiring Native American laborers.[11] In light of the productive manpower tied up in gold mining, and supporting services, the rapid expansion in grain acreage and production seems remarkable. However, when taking into consideration the increased demand within California, and the use of cheap Indian labor in grain farming, then this is not surprising. Moreover, from a long historical

---

[10] Clifford E. Trafzer and Joel R. Hyer, eds. *Exterminate Them!: Written Accounts of the Murder, Rape, and Enslavement of Native Americans during the California Gold Rush* (East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1999), xiv.

[11] Gerber, 35-44. "The Mexican system," refers to employing Indians in the community, rather than confining them to a reservation.

perspective, it anticipated California's unique agricultural system, in which large land holdings are privileged over small family farms, and through the use of immigrant labor and/or domestic urban unemployed. In order to maximize profits, this system required the exploitation of groups that were considered or rendered powerless--economically, socially, and politically.[12]

The production of these California "Bonanza Farms" rapidly increased, so that by 1855 surpluses were exported to European markets, especially Great Britain.[13] Total acreage and production reached its peak in 1889, with forty million bushels harvested from 2.75 million acres.[14] Millions of acres were cropped year after year, with no rotation or rest for the soil. This practice was not farming as stewardship of the land; rather it was extraction, a sort of mining.[15] After decades of

---

[12] Daniel, *Bitter Harvest*, 24, 36.

[13] Gerber, 38.

[14] Alan L. Olmstead and Paul W. Rhode, "The Evolution of California Agriculture, 1850-2000," in *California Agriculture: Dimensions and Issues*, ed. Jerome B. Seibert (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), 2,3,5.

[15] Carey McWilliams, *Factories In The Field* (Santa Barbara: Peregrine Publishers, Inc., 1971), 52.

[15] McWilliams, 59.

monoculture, the crop yields began to drop. World production had also been growing, including wheat from the Mississippi Valley, but declining yields per acre were more responsible for the drop in returns than external price competition.[16] The "bonanza" returns on wheat dwindled to the extent that grains never again held the dominant position in California agriculture. By 1910, acreage planted in wheat had declined by eighty percent from its peak, reached just twenty years earlier.[17]

The California Gold Rush forced sudden challenges on a society that had sprung up seemingly overnight. Food was needed in large quantities, and was imported from Chile, Oregon, and from the eastern United States. The surge in demand offered an opportunity for capitalists to grow the food locally,[18] but the early consolidation of large land holdings prevented the natural development of communities of family farms. Instead of each family working its own land, with a hired hand of equal social status, these new land barons adopted the use of workers who were chronically

---

[16] Rhode, "Learning," 786.

[17] Rhode, 773.

[18] Gerber, 43.

powerless, whether it was based on their minority racial status or on what Daniel called "pronounced socioeconomic alienation."[19]

Economist Paul Rhode challenges conventional thinking that attributes the transition from grains to intensively farmed specialty crops as being primarily due to diminishing returns in the grains sector. Nor should primary significance be given to the increase in irrigation, the completion of the transcontinental railroad, or an increased availability of cheap labor. Rhode places primary importance on two factors: affordable capital and applied agricultural science, what he terms "biological learning."[20]

Rhode emphasizes the lack of affordable capital as a block to the growth of specialty crop agriculture. The high cost of capital, that is, a high interest rate, operates like a heavy tax that retards new business ventures such as buying and planting a citrus grove, as well as making improvements to existing businesses.[21] Rates remained in the

---

[19] Daniel, 58.

[20] Rhode, 774.

[21] Rhode, 790-795. Rhode reasons that high interest rates also contributed to the decline in crop yields on the grain farms, because

15 to 20 percent range in the 1870s, but had fallen into the 8 to 12 percent range by 1890.[22] Capital investment in specialty crops includes the purchase of the land and planting trees, but also irrigation, caring for the trees during the long maturation period (five to seven years for citrus),[23] and making mortgage payments and covering living expenses until the trees begin to bear fruit. When capital is unaffordable, the interest pushes expenses above the break-even point, discouraging planting and even the initial purchase of the land. Investors who had their own capital during this phase of California's development would have had a significant advantage in acquiring large land holdings. An early start in planting citrus groves translated to a head start in generating income during the boom that started in the 1880s, and the accumulation of

---

in order to make loan payments, the farmers could not afford to leave a significant part of their productive capacity fallow, nor afford to buy manure for their fields, dooming those fields to overwork and depletion.

[22] Rhode, 776. Although many factors influenced growth in agriculture, such as population increase, harvested acreage in California increased twenty percent from 1890 to 1900, and irrigated land increased by forty percent during the same period (of rates dropping into 8-12% range).

[23] Walter Reuther, Herbert John Webber, and Leon Dexter Batchelor, eds. *The Citrus Industry, Vol. 1: History, World Distribution, Botany and Varieties* Rev.ed. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967), 484.

capital to fuel more land acquisition, that could be used to plant more citrus trees.

California's isolation from the more highly populated states east of the Mississippi was felt in the early scarcity of capital. California needed to build up its own stock of capital. This was accomplished by exporting goods, as well as by accumulation of gold. Additionally, the state's economy needed to develop a financing "infrastructure," that is, banks that can distribute capital efficiently. Once these developments took place the cost of capital dropped, and specialty crop agriculture grew significantly, starting in the 1880s.[24]

"Biological learning" contributed significantly to specialty crop cultures during the period 1879-1929. California was relatively unknown territory when it entered the Union in 1850, and learning by trial and error was expensive and risky. An educated farmer has a greater possibility to be a successful farmer, so the state undertook to educate farmers and to build its own storehouse of agricultural knowledge. The practical objectives were to get the best pairing of crops with soil

---

[24] Rhode, 791 (footnote 30)

types and available moisture, and to establish and use the systematic collection of meteorological data. As an example, the citrus industry benefited from this research, in its continual efforts to limit damage to the groves from freezes.[25] The state encouraged a partnership between business and government, provided by the California State Board of Horticulture (established 1883), the University of California Cooperative Extension (established 1913), the California Agricultural Experiment Stations, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture.[26]

Intensive farming also required a reliable water source and the irrigation systems that delivered the water required heavy capital investment. Irrigation did not result in a significant increase in overall cultivated acreage in the state; instead it resulted in intensive

---

[25] Herbert John Webber, et al. "A Study of the Effects of Freezes on Citrus in California," *College of Agriculture, Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin no. 304* (January 1919): 247-275.

[26] Reuther, et al., 33-37; Rhode, "Learning," 794-796; Ann Foley Scheuring, *"A Sustaining Comradeship": the Story of University of California Cooperative Extension, 1913-1988: a Brief History Prepared for UCCE's 75th Anniversary* (Berkeley, Calif: Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources, University of California, 1988). Soils scientist Eugene W. Hilgard was the first Dean of the Agricultural College of the University of California, and upon his appointment in 1874, he founded the first Agricultural Experiment Station (AES), in Berkeley. The Riverside AES followed in 1907, and dedicated its present site in 1918, now surrounded by the University of California Riverside.

cultivation of crops such as citrus in Southern California[27] and cotton in the San Joaquin Valley. Maximum income per acre is achieved by combining many trees per acre, with the scientific application of water, that is, the right amount at the right time. This scientific combination of resources is the essence of intensive farming.

The completion of the transcontinental railroad in 1869 was a hopeful sign of commercial and social benefits to come. But three obstacles had to be overcome before the railroads could develop a close and profitable relationship with the citrus industry: first, preventing spoilage in the transport of perishable fruit meant the development of cool temperature storage technology combined with routing fruit-bearing rail cars expeditiously; second, rail lines needed to be extended, to provide access to all citrus producing regions; and third, growers of all fruits and nuts sought lower rail rates through competition (it still cost less to ship fruit direct to export markets by sea, rather than

---

[27] Sucheng Chan, *This Bittersweet Soil: The Chinese in California Agriculture, 1860-1910* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 324.

overland to the East and then onboard a ship).[28] All three of these obstacles were overcome in the 1880s.[29]

The convergence of these factors in the 1880s coincided with the emergence of California's specialty crop agriculture, and specifically, led to the beginnings of the modern citrus industry in Riverside and San Bernardino counties. The stock of affordable capital became great enough to enable the investments that remade California's agricultural landscape. Biological learning made an invaluable contribution, guiding growers toward success in the field and on the balance sheet. Irrigation played a crucial role in the development of tens of thousands of new acres planted in citrus, and in the towns surrounded by them. As the transportation system steadily increased growers' access to local and distant markets, expanding crop yields rose to fill thousands of carloads of fruit per month, shipped on the new rail lines. These advances in capitalization, biological learning, irrigation, and

---

[28] Rahno Mabel MacCurdy and V.A. Lockebey, *Selling The Gold: History of Sunkist and Pure Gold* (Upland, CA: The Upland Public Library Foundation, 1999), 37. The first direct shipment of California oranges and lemons, bound for London by sea, embarked from Los Angeles in April 1921. The water rate was less than half that of shipping cross-country by rail, and then by sea from New York to London.

[29] Rhode, 784-785.

transportation, made possible the rapid transition to intensive cultivation of the specialty crops for which California was to become world-famous: grapes, almonds, oranges, and cotton, to name but a few. Acreage in these types of crops grew from five percent in 1879 to thirty-five percent of the total in 1929. But it is in dollar value where the dramatic shift is truly revealed: specialty crops represented only four percent of total farm income in 1879, but by 1929, were generating eighty percent of California's farm income.[30] Citrus became California's highest income-producing specialty crop during this period.

Demand for cheap labor also increased as farming became more intensive, and was fulfilled by a succession of immigrant groups and native-born migrants. These workers were essential to the success of a system that exploited their powerlessness.

Those Who Toiled in Specialty Crop Agriculture

In *Bittersweet Harvest*, Cletus Daniel sums up the effects of large-scale commercial farming on labor:

> If farming on a small scale discouraged the growth of rigid class divisions between farmers and their hired laborers, the social and psychological climate on the large-scale commercial farm promoted impenetrable

---

[30] Olmstead and Rhode, "The Evolution of California Agriculture," 4.

> class and caste lines that admitted of not the slightest ambiguity.[31]

This type of agriculture drew plain and permanent battle lines between grower and workers.[32] Unsurprisingly, the similar experiences of the non-white groups who worked in specialty crops and citrus, revealed an underlying pattern of inviting and then rejecting immigrant groups from the late 1800s through the 1930s. The recurrence of this pattern was prompted by a labor shortage, caused by the mistreatment or exclusion of a previous group. The replacement group was welcomed, but later faced rejection as well. Native Americans were employed on the early grain farms, but their population in the state declined by eighty percent from 1848 to 1868. They died from disease, by destruction of their families and their means of survival, and by outright killings.[33] With the diminishing of their presence, a new source of cheap labor was needed.

Idled Chinese railroad workers were available to fill the void. Chinese labor was desirable because it was

---

[31] Daniel, 17.

[32] Daniel, 17.

[33] Trafzer and Hyer, *Exterminate Them!*, xiv.

"cheap, reliable and convenient to engage."[34] Chinese workers did migrate to the citrus groves of Riverside and San Bernardino counties as seasonal workers.[35] The rejection of the Chinese by the dominant society was accomplished in exclusionary laws designed to deny entry to new immigrants, to deport those deemed illegal, and to deny citizenship to Chinese immigrants.[36] Without new hired hands from China, exclusion also effectively diminished their ability to compete as growers themselves. It also slowed the growth of the Chinese American population.[37]

Growers welcomed Japanese immigrants as an alternative labor source to Chinese workers and were willing to engage their labor through lease agreements in the early 1900s. The Japanese faced rejection by nativists as well, who especially objected to their settlements, which the

---

[34] Sucheng Chan, *This Bittersweet Soil: The Chinese in California Agriculture, 1860-1910* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 276-77. Chan explains that Varden Fuller's use of the term "cheap," did not just mean low wages, but rather an overall low annual labor cost, when workers were only hired as needed, and not employed year round.

[35] Chan, 159.

[36] Mae M. Ngai, *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 18.

[37] Chan, 387, 406-407. Chinese traditions and the expense of travel limited the number of female immigrants, prior to Exclusion. This meant that the growth of the Chinese American population after Exclusion became dependent on a limited number of American-born Chinese females.

nativists saw as ruining those areas for "white settlement and the desirable element."[38] Exclusion began diplomatically in the Gentleman's Agreement of 1907 (emigration restriction by the Japanese government) and statutorily in the Alien Land Law of 1913, which prohibited the ownership and restricted the leasing of land by aliens.[39]

Mexican immigrants offset an acute labor shortage in the Southwest, caused by the First World War and later by the Johnson-Reed Act of 1924,[40] which explicitly excluded Asians, and curtailed the immigration of southern and eastern Europeans. During the Great Depression however, demand for all workers was at an all-time low. One solution was to decrease the supply of labor, especially illegal aliens. In the Southwest, anyone of Mexican descent came under suspicion. Through intimidation, an estimated half-million Mexican immigrants and Mexican Americans were repatriated from 1929 to 1939, by deportation, voluntarily, or with help from welfare bureaus or charities.[41]

---

[38] Ngai, 38-39.

[39] Vaught, 119, 145-147.

[40] Ngai., 7.

[41] Ngai, 71-75; Devra Weber, *Dark Sweat, White Gold: California Farm Workers, Cotton, and the New Deal.* (Berkeley: University of California

In this pattern of invitation and rejection, the Chinese, Japanese, and Mexican workers were welcomed by growers, but were also victims of the contradictions of a society whose business class needs were in opposition to the racial imperatives of the non-grower white population. That population sought at minimum, to marginalize and segregate the alien presence in their midst, and at maximum, to remove them.

Historical Background of Citrus

Citrus fruits were introduced to the Americas during colonization by the Spanish and Portuguese, and were planted in California missions that were founded by the Franciscans who came to Christianize the natives. They established their first location in Alta California, at Mission San Diego de Alcala in 1769. The first sizable grove was planted at the Mission San Gabriel in approximately 1800. For unexplained reasons, these mission plantings were not available to outsiders, prior to

---

Press, 1994), 77; Abraham Hoffman, "Mexican Repatriation Statistics: Some Suggested Alternatives to Carey McWilliams," *Western Historical Quarterly* 3, no. 4 (Oct., 1972): 391-404.

secularization of the missions by the Mexican government in 1833. Soon thereafter, a Kentucky trapper named William Wolfskill was able to obtain sweet orange cuttings from Mission San Gabriel, and "set out" the first commercial grove of citrus in California, in 1841.[42]

Wolfskill's planting proved to be prescient. His grove was maturing just as gold was discovered in 1848. When his oranges brought premium prices in San Francisco, others began to plant their own citrus groves. In 1867, there were twenty thousand trees planted in the state, more than eighty percent of which were in Los Angeles.[43] By 1891 however, the number of bearing (mature) orange and lemon trees had surpassed one million, and the total number of trees, including non-bearing or still maturing trees, was greater than four million.[44]

In the earlier discussion of the factors that stimulated the growth of specialty crop agriculture, the widespread adoption of biological learning is given a prominent position along with affordable capital. In

---

[42] Reuther, et al., 26.

[43] Reuther, et al., 27; Starr, *Inventing The Dream*, 140.

[44] "Orange and Lemon Trees in California," *Santa Ana Weekly Blade*, December 24, 1891.

general terms, educating farmers greatly benefited California's agriculture and California's economy. The value of biological learning can have no better illustration, than in the story of three small orange trees that were planted in the front yard of Eliza and Luther Tibbets in 1874.[45]

The Tibbets' had moved to Riverside from Washington D.C., where they were friends and neighbors to William O. Saunders, horticulturalist and Superintendent of Gardens and Grounds, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Eliza wrote Saunders, asking about plants that would be compatible with the climate in Riverside. In his capacity, Saunders supervised the Plant Importation Program of the USDA,[46] an ambitious program that sought beneficial foreign plants from around the world, which might be profitably used by American farmers. In 1870, he received a dozen budded navel

---

[45] Reuther, et al., 484; Starr, *Inventing The Dream,* 141. Starr notes that the trees were planted in December 1873. The discrepancy between the planting date of 1874 given in Reuther, and the popular belief that motivated the Orange Day Celebration in 1933, is of minor import, given the far-reaching effect of those plantings, whether in late 1873 or early 1874.

[46] Knowles A. Ryerson, "History and Significance of the Foreign Plant Introduction Work of the United States Department of Agriculture," *Agricultural History* 7, no. 3 (July 1933): 110-128.

trees from Bahia, Brazil, sent by Presbyterian missionaries, Mr. and Mrs. F.I.C. Schneider. Saunders shipped three propagated trees to Tibbets.

Two of the trees sent to Tibbets by Saunders survived and bore fruit early. Their fruit drew immediate acclaim when shown at a citrus fair held by the Southern California Horticultural Society in 1879.[47] The seedless and sweet fruit was particularly well suited to the soil and dryer inland climate of the citrus belt that extended eastward along the base of the San Gabriel and San Bernardino mountains. The fruit's thick skin offered protection in transit. Buds from trees that bore such a delicious and hardy fruit were suddenly in high demand, and so millions of navel orange trees in California would trace their "parentage" to the original trees sent to Eliza Tibbets by William O. Saunders.

Once the variety of orange was found that would thrive in the decomposed granite soil and hot climate of the inland valleys, plentiful and reliable sources of water became a priority. Matthew Gage was a jeweler by trade, but a land developer at heart. Gage purchased 640 acres of dry

---

[47] Reuther, et al., 484-485.

land in Riverside, and under the Desert Irrigation Act, had three years to bring water to it in order to obtain full title. By artful acquisitions, options, and financing, Gage realized his vision of a twenty-mile canal. Gage's Canal opened up thousands of acres of the area known as Arlington Heights for profitable navel orange production. The canal's twenty-mile run was completed by 1888. When the land boom sparked by canal construction subsided, Gage was forced to enter into partnership with an English corporation named the Riverside Trust Co., Ltd., in 1889, with Gage as its managing director. Land values eventually made the stockholders of the corporation rich, and the groves planted on Arlington Heights made their owners wealthy in their own right. Such was the lure of California's liquid gold.[48]

The success of citrus in California was not a foregone conclusion once William Wolfskill planted the first commercial grove. Growers were presented with major obstacles in every aspect of citriculture[49] and the citrus business: natural selection of the best species through

---

[48] Starr, *Inventing The Dream*, 145; Tom Patterson, *A Colony for California: Riverside's First Hundred Years*, 2nd ed. (Riverside, CA: Riverside Museum Press, 1996), 179-188.

[49] Citriculture is short for citrus horticulture or citrus agriculture.

trial and costly error; finding the best ways to organize capital, both for planting the groves and bringing water to them; using scientific methods to overcome pests, drought, floods and freezes; the constant need for plentiful and cheap labor. Having overcome these obstacles, the growers were still at risk of financial ruin in the early 1890s, if they could not get their crop transported safely and sold at a fair price. Clearing this last hurdle would put California citrus growers on the road to stability and profitability, and become the economic underpinning for their communities.

"That Every Market Shall Be Supplied"

T.H.C. Chamblin was a key figure in the founding of the California Fruit Growers Exchange, which saved many growers who were facing bankruptcy under the system that was dominated by commission brokers, packers, and shippers. In 1893, the board of directors of the newly established Riverside Fruit Exchange issued this statement, which succinctly expressed the desperation of the growers and what the board thought should be done about it:

> The one great evil that confronts us and threatens us is that of consigning fruit to parties whose only interest is their brokerage. This evil must be cut up by the roots; totally and unflinchingly eradicated.

> Growers must stop their ears to the blandishments of shrewd manipulators.[50]

Chamblin was part of the Pachappa Orange Growers Association in Riverside, started in the late 1880s by "eleven neighbors and friends," who agreed to pool their fruit for sale.[51] As the first strictly cooperative organization, it became the starting point, if not the model for what eventually became Sunkist Growers.

Local commission brokers dominated the early marketing of California citrus, partnering with packinghouses and shippers, and were adept at manipulating low prices to the growers. Before the cooperatives, marketing of the fruit was a disjointed system that placed all of the risk on the grower and created wild swings in supply and prices. The fruit was shipped on consignment, and shipped free on board (f.o.b.) destination, meaning that the growers still owned the shipped fruit, and were also paying the freight. They were helpless to change this paradigm by virtue of

---

[50] Rahno Mabel MacCurdy and V.A. Lockebey, *Selling The Gold: History of Sunkist and Pure Gold.* (Upland, CA: The Upland Public Library Foundation, 1999), 13.

[51] MacCurdy and Lockebey, 10-11.

increased production and had no other means of marketing their fruit.[52]

The earliest attempt at organizing the citrus growers was made in 1885, in the Orange Growers Protective Union (Riverside). It sent two of its own agents "East" to sell the Union's fruit. Ultimately it failed because it was not mandatory for the growers to sell through the Union's agents, and commission men were able to break down solidarity by offering better prices. Other organizations failed when they included packinghouses in the scheme. Growers finally recognized that their interests and those of independent packers were at odds.[53]

In 1892, the Pachappa Orange Growers Association was formally incorporated. For the first two years, they contracted with a packer, but in 1895, they acquired their own packinghouse. Many growers in the Riverside area inquired about an expanded organization, to encompass the Riverside area. May 5, 1893 marked the beginning of the Riverside Fruit Exchange, combining ten local associations into what was to be the first district exchange of the

---

[52] MacCurdy and Lockebey, 11; P.J. Dreher, "Early History of Cooperative Marketing of Citrus Fruit," California Citrograph, October 1916, 2.

[53] MacCurdy and Lockebey, 9-11.

Southern California Fruit Exchange. In the manifesto published by the board, a later clause took a less belligerent tone, in stating that:

> Once again let it be noted that we are not combining for war, but for defense. We do insist that the men who invest money and toil and take the risks are entitled to a fair and ordinarily certain share of the profits.[54]

A more positive expression of what they hoped to accomplish with their protective association, is noted:

> We are to seek not only to offer our goods in such attractive contribution as to increase the demand and open new markets, but to so distribute that every market shall be supplied and none glutted.[55]

The Claremont California Fruit Growers Association was being formed at about the same time as the Riverside Fruit Exchange, and under Peter J. Dreher's leadership, they broke away from the old system entirely. They used three methods to sell their fruit: at auction through eastern brokers, sell direct through brokers appointed by the association, and by export. The Southern California Fruit Exchange later adopted these methods.[56]

---

[54] MacCurdy and Lockebey, 13.

[55] MacCurdy and Lockebey, 13.

[56] MacCurdy and Lockebey, 14-15.

In April 1893, about one hundred prominent growers met in the Chamber of Commerce Hall in Los Angeles to discuss a comprehensive approach. Both Chamblin and Dreher were appointed to the committee, which would write the rules for local association formation. The movement spread rapidly, and local associations and exchanges were organized in all districts in about four months. On August 29, 1893, a general plan was submitted and adopted, which combined all district exchanges under a central marketing authority, the Southern California Fruit Exchange.[57] The new organization was not a panacea, and had growing pains. Growers to the north had had the same experiences, and sought alignment with their fellows in the south. In 1905, the organization was renamed the California Fruit Growers Exchange (CFGE).[58] Thus began the organizing of all aspects of the industry: cultivation, picking, packing, and most importantly, the marketing of their own fruit.

CFGE vertically integrated supplies through the Fruit Exchange Supply Co., and built plants to process culls into by-products such as pectin, citric acid, and orange and

---

[57] MacCurdy and Lockebey, 16.

[58] MacCurdy and Lockebey, 16-28.

lemon oils, in the Fruit Exchange Orange Products and Fruit Exchange Lemon Products plants. CFGE also bought hundreds of thousands of acres of timber in Northern California, in order to control the supply and cost of box "shook"[59] from which the crates were built, that displayed the labels which are now treasured as cultural icons.[60]

But what really made California oranges and lemons a smashing success was the advertising campaigns that brought the image of sun-kissed oranges into homes all across America. In 1907, the Southern Pacific Railroad and the CFGE jointly funded a trainload of oranges to Iowa, promoting "Oranges for Health, California for Wealth." The Sunkist brand was copyrighted in 1908. The partnership between CFGE and the Chicago advertising firm of Lord and Thomas busily constructed campaigns that connected California's citrus fruits with health, domestic bliss, and even success. The "Drink an Orange," campaign (1916) made

---

[59] Shook refers to the slats and other parts that were used to assemble orange crates in the packinghouse. The CFGE owned 373,000 acres of timber in 1972, when it closed the last plant making shook. MacCurdy and Lockebey, 33.

[60] Grace Larsen and H.E. Erdman, "Development of Revolving Finance in Sunkist Growers," *Journal of Farm Economics* 41, no. 4 (November 1959): 769-780.

it common for fresh orange juice to be consumed in public venues like drug stores and soda fountains. A natural complement to that idea was to sell glass juicers with the Sunkist brand embossed on them. Other promotional campaigns followed.[61] The simple act of stamping "Sunkist" on each and every piece of fresh fruit kept the brand name in front of the consumer, even as it sat in a bowl on the dining room table. These efforts were rewarded with a growing consumer market that viewed citrus fruit not as a luxury, but as a dietary staple.[62]

Not all growers affiliated with the massive CFGE, and a smaller group named the Mutual Orange Distributors formed in Redlands in 1906, and American Fruit Growers formed in 1918. By 1921, CFGE accounted for seventy-three percent of the growers, and MOD for another ten percent. By 1939, cooperative marketing controlled eighty-five percent of the California citrus crop, attesting to the benefits that accrued to stable supply and stable prices.[63] Importantly,

---

[61] Starr, *Inventing The Dream*, 162.

[62] Starr, 162.

[63] Ronald Tobey and Charles Wetherell, "The Citrus Industry and the Revolution of Corporate Capitalism in Southern California, 1887-1944," *California History* 74, no.1 (Spring 1995): 8.

since the local associations owned the packinghouses, labor control was also centralized. If growers did not compete with each other for workers to pick their fruit, wage stability could be sustained, at rates beneficial to the growers.

It is not entirely clear that what many small ranchers would have called ruin, that is, their own exit from citrus cultivation, would have resulted in the loss of their acreage to cultivation, or whether they would have simply been supplanted by an earlier consolidation of acreage, as occurred in the cotton fields of the San Joaquin Valley in the inter-war years. This hypothesis would therefore indicate that the cooperative movement in citrus forestalled consolidation and resulted in an extended era where most of the acreage was represented by small ranches (ten to fifteen acres). However, these small growers were under no less pressure to control costs than were larger growers, perhaps more. This reprieve allowed the myth of citrus cultivation as an agrarian family endeavor to continue, for a time.

The Great Depression was no less an existential threat to these many ranchers than was the market chaos of the early 1890s. Communal action saved these small landholding

ranchers then. What sustained them in the 1930s were market discipline, and their neighbors. In a valley filled with ten, fifteen, or twenty-acre ranches, neighbors were close by. Children of the ranches grew up together. The sons of middle class ranchers likely spent summers and weekends with their fathers in the groves, learning the family business. There is much less community in a valley where three or four growers hold a thousand acres each. Without the vibrancy of families, what is left is a company town, periodically filled with migrant labor, which vanishes when the picking is done. Although these smaller ranches were not true yeoman farms, the cooperative movement created a valley filled with family-owned citrus groves, to the benefit of the greater community. The primary failing of this arrangement was its class system, largely based on race or ethnicity. Upward mobility in the industry for Mexican workers was either very rare or non-existent. Something approximating the leasing or tenancy practices by Japanese families in the Central Valley might have begun to lower social and economic barriers between growers and workers in Redlands or Riverside. As it stood, class and ethnic lines remained clearly defined.

Citrus in the Great Depression

Citrus income had held up longer into the Depression than other crops, but by 1933, prices were below pre-Depression levels.[64] National citrus farm income for oranges and grapefruit had dropped from an average of $133.8 million during the period 1924-1928, to just $68.56 million in 1933.[65] In his report on citrus to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration (AAA), Senior Agricultural Economist E.W. Braun attributed this severe decrease in income to two factors: the decline in purchasing power of consumers, and an increase of forty percent in boxes shipped of both oranges and grapefruit, also compared to average annual shipments in the 1924-1928 period.[66]

One of the top concerns for individual growers was to get operational credit in an environment where banks did not have the capital or would not lend it. Here, the Farm Credit Administration (FCA), a New Deal program, came to the rescue, allowing small growers to borrow enough to

---

[64] MacCurdy and Lockebey, 44.

[65] U.S.Department of Agriculture. Agricultural Adjustment Administration, *The Citrus Program Under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration*, by E.W. Braun (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1934).

[66] *The Citrus Program Under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration.*

cover production costs for a given year. This not only kept the grower in business, it also circulated money in the local economy.[67]

Under the AAA, citrus was not considered a staple crop. It was one of many special crops with limited cultivation range and for which production could not easily be reduced. Cotton acreage can be reduced by plowing it under, or by not planting in the first place; reducing citrus output means taking out trees. If market conditions were reversed, that is, if demand exceeded supply, citrus production would take another five to seven years to regain the lost capacity. It was therefore the goal of the AAA to regulate special crop shipments, in order to maintain consistent supply and stabilize prices.[68] This goal aligned perfectly with CFGE's fundamental purpose. Marketing agreements were concluded in December 1933 that would prorate or regulate shipments, a system designed to stabilize prices. The prorate system allowed every grower

---

[67] "Credit Association Formed For Farmers," *Riverside Daily Press*, February 24, 1934; MacCurdy and Lockebey, *Selling the Gold*, 45.

[68] U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, *Agricultural Adjustment: A Report of Administration of the Agricultural Adjustment Act May 1933 to February 1934* (Washington, D.C.: 1934): 181-85.

to ship fruit, but not his entire crop all at once. Instead, he would ship in increments proportional to his percentage of the entire crop for his local cooperative, folded into regional and national quotas.

The AAA and the CFGE were aligned in pursuit of supply and price stability, something the CFGE had been dedicated to for almost forty years. There were two additional benefits. First, under normal circumstances, independent growers benefited from the discipline of the cooperatives, enjoying the same prices without being accountable if they shipped their entire crops. Under the AAA Marketing Agreements, they were brought into the greater program, thereby unifying market discipline of all growers, so that all growers had the same chance to survive the Depression, and still be in business when the recovery arrived.[69] The second benefit is the cooperation that the prorate program required between the cooperatives, who all had seats on the board that set shipment quantities on a weekly basis.[70]

---

[69] Charles C. Teague, "Making Proration Work," in *10 Talks on Citrus Marketing* (Los Angeles, 1939), 13-16.

[70] Charles C. Teague, "The Need For Orderly Distribution," in *10 Talks on Citrus Marketing* (Los Angeles, 1939), 1-4. Teague's radio broadcasts addressed internal strife between the coops on the prorate board, and were successful in generating continued support for the program.

Table 1. shows navel orange receipts, price per box and the quantity of boxes shipped for the Redlands-Highland Fruit Exchange for the years 1931 to 1938.

Table 1. Navel orange income of the Redlands-Highland Fruit Exchange during the Great Depression

Year	1931	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936	1937	1938
Total Receipts (in millions)	$3.4	$2.47	$1.9	$2.2	$3.8	$2.92	$3.0	$2.87
Average Price Per Box	$2.21	$1.95	$1.61	$2.02	$1.90	$2.27	$3.10	$1.55
Boxes (in millions)	1.77	1.27	1.39	1.26	2.39	1.77	1.11	2.0

Source: Data adapted from Redlands-Highland Fruit Exchange Annual Reports, 1931-1938, A.K. Smiley Public Library, Citrus Collection

The table shows that navel income rose from its bottom in 1933 and stayed in the three million dollar range for the last half of the 1930s, but it is unclear if the AAA or the weather had more impact. For example, the lowest quantity shipped was in 1937, due to the occurrence of a devastating freeze. The quantity of boxes shipped was the lowest, but the price per box was the highest for the entire eight-year period, yielding the third highest income in the eight years. This might be thought of as nature's prorate.

Judging the effectiveness of the AAA is not the purpose of this brief study, but the combined benefits

provided by FCA loans and the marketing agreements created an environment that allowed the individual growers to survive and the overall industry to achieve a stability that would propel it to its greatest heights in the next two decades.

Conclusion

In specialty crop agriculture, growers seek to minimize their competition in the market, in conjunction with maximizing competition among the workers. Cooperatives such as the CFGE achieved the former goal, and served as economic foundations for communities of growers. Suppressing labor organizing was essential to the controlling of labor costs. Strikes by Orange County citrus pickers in 1936, and by packinghouse workers in Corona in 1941, exposed the fault lines between growers and workers. Acknowledging and bargaining with a citrus workers union would mean more than the loss of control over labor costs. It would mean that the workers had achieved the same status that the growers had sought in 1905: control of their own assets in the capitalist system. The strikes had limited success in securing higher wages, but had great

significance as a demonstration of community action by the workers, which would lead to future social and political successes.

California's distance from the rest of the United States, its unique blend of diverse cultivation conditions and spaces, and the discovery of gold, led to policies and processes that engendered a bonanza mentality in agriculture. Vast wealth was created, but at the cost of damage to Indian populations, followed by exploitation of waves of foreign, non-white labor. In the citrus industry, it was as if the groves were a dark green wall, separating winners and losers, exploiters and exploited, growers and workers.

CHAPTER TWO

SHARED SPACES, SEPARATE LIVES

On January 31, 1934, the front page of the *Corona Daily Independent* illustrated just how separate were the lives and perceptions of the growers and their workers. In the upper left corner, a photograph shows three local beauties "beaming a smiling welcome to San Bernardino, home of the National Orange Show, California's Greatest Midwinter Event." In the very next column, a headline reads "Alleged Agitators Given Boot Out of County After Trial." The two agitators were arrested by police for "asserted efforts to cause a strike among Mexican orange pickers of this district." They were charged with vagrancy, and released on the condition that they leave the county immediately and never return.[1]

Both stories appear to be straightforward reports. Yet each story held deeper meanings, representing both sides of the economic, social, and political order that arose in conjunction with the citrus industry. The former announces a celebration of citrus culture, while the latter gives an

---

[1] "Alleged Agitators Given Boot Out of County After Trial," *Corona Daily Independent*, January 31, 1934.

account of trouble averted, through the prompt actions of the police and a local court. In the 1930s, citrus culture in Southern California was a way of life, and events like the National Orange Show gave expression to those cultural beliefs. The backbone of citrus culture, as celebrated by the show, were the growers, whose horticultural ideals and business skills, had transformed a desert into a garden. Their success had also required cheap labor, and workers who were accepting of their role in the system. Blaming outside forces for labor unrest made it easier to justify the repression of labor organizing and to rationalize the status quo.[2]

This chapter examines how growers and workers formed separate communities, but the examination will also look beneath the expected differences, in search of commonalities. Growers expressed community in many formal ways, through their professional organizations, industry publications, and expressed through institutions, including citrus cooperatives themselves. Local newspaper society pages announced family events, such as births and weddings,

---

[2] Jose M. Alamillo, *Making Lemonade Out of Lemons: Mexican American Labor and Leisure in a California Town, 1880-1960* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press: 2006), 127.

and various club and lodge meetings. In this capacity, newspapers also served as an institution, one that provided a public validation of these events.

Specialty crop growers worked to maximize profits, as in any capitalist enterprise, but they also wanted to believe that their way of life was serving the greater society, in ways such as improving the diet of the American family, in generating income and wealth for the state, and for the aesthetic value of the groves and orchards themselves.[3] Their professed desire to use white American workers notwithstanding,[4] they preferred workers who had no choice but to accept low wages, and who would not be the source of trouble economically or socially. In short, powerlessness was a virtue in an agricultural worker.

By the 1930s, Mexican workers had become the dominant ethnic group working in California agriculture, and were the most numerous in the citrus groves of Riverside and San

---

[3] David Vaught, *Cultivating California: Growers, Specialty Crops, and Labor, 1875-1920* (John Hopkins University Press, 1999), 3.

[4] Cletus E. Daniel, *Bitter Harvest: A History of California Farmworkers, 1870-1941* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981), 57.

Bernardino counties.[5] Their story of community formation begins with how and why they came to work in California agriculture, the push-pull of their exodus from Mexico to the American Southwest. Pushed by economic and political turmoil, and then a violent revolution, they were drawn northward to better paying jobs and a chance at a new life in the United States. Whether Mexican workers were provided housing on large citrus ranches, or congregated in neighborhoods near the groves, the stability of the citrus harvest cycles allowed them to create communal life, based on family, their commonalities of culture, and their shared economic class.

The paternalistic relationship between growers and workers was bound to become adversarial, because growers sought to control wages and were willing to create competition among the workers, in order to maintain control.[6] The extraordinary event of The Great Depression put additional downward pressure on prices and wages,

---

[5] Vaught, 184, Daniel, 66-67, Matt Garcia, *A World Of Its Own: Race, Labor and Citrus in the Making of Greater Los Angeles, 1900-1970* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001), 46.

[6] Ronald Tobey and Charles Wetherell, "The Citrus Industry and the Revolution of Corporate Capitalism in Southern California, 1887-1944," *California History* 74, no. 1 (Spring, 1995): 16.

resulting in labor unrest. Grower responses to labor organizing caused several clashes between these communities, which removed the facade of paternalistic concern for worker welfare that the growers had constructed since the First World War.[7]

A Community of Growers

Applying one of Benedict Anderson's concepts in *Imagined Communities* to the citrus industry offers a theoretical framework to understand community formation. Colonial creole functionaries played a key role in creating imagined communities that led to nationalism. In this concept, the creole cadre was a key source of stability and loyalty in the colony. They were educated and able, however, they were separate (inferior) from the pure-born metropolitan elite. They could never be part of the ruling class, nor be invited to join in ruling in the metropole. This hard line of demarcation awakened them to the fact that they had more in common with their fellow creole elites, and natives, than with the metropole. They

---

[7] Jose M. Alamillo, *Making Lemonade Out of Lemons: Mexican American Labor and Leisure in a California Town, 1880-1960* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press: 2006), 25,130.

consequently decided to make an imagined community into a real one.[8] Although this is a simplified explanation, it has applicability to both growers and workers.

Growers were certainly not colonized by anyone, but the commission brokers, packers and shippers were indeed exploiting the weak position of disorganized growers, for their own enrichment. This exploitation posed an existential threat to many of the growers.[9] In a time of crisis and hardship, people compose community out of real and perceived commonalities. By organizing themselves, the growers bypassed the middlemen who were exploiting their weakness and took control of their own destiny. In this way, the California Fruit Growers Exchange (CFGE) became a unifying institution. This concept can also be applied to workers, particularly along class lines. Organizing for collective bargaining could certainly be considered a challenge to grower paternalism. But the workers had no intention of withdrawing from the system, only in gaining some leverage and a better life within it.

---

[8] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* rev. ed. (London: Verson, 1991), 47-65.

[9] Rahno Mabel MacCurdy and V.A. Lockebey, *Selling The Gold: History of Sunkist and Pure Gold* (Upland, CA: The Upland Public Library Foundation, 1999), 11.

Specialty crop growers were neither yeoman farmers in the Jeffersonian sense, nor amoral industrialists fixated on maximizing profits. They were businessmen who also saw themselves as horticulturalists, with a mission to build "small, virtuous communities *and* economic development."[10] Their smaller farms and proximity to the neighboring communities created a connection that inspired Chester Rowell, editor of the Fresno Morning Republican, to state that public affairs included raisins.[11] This sentiment implied interdependence between horticulturalists and the communities nearby.[12]

Horticulture required a "specific 'class of people,' pursuing a 'pleasant and profitable life' in microenvironments where water and other natural advantages were abundant."[13] Vaught points to the frequent appearance of these two phrases in newspapers, farm journals, and popular literature, as an indication that fruit and nut

---

[10] David Vaught, *Cultivating California: Growers, Specialty Crops, and Labor, 1875-1920*, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), 10.

[11] Vaught, 1.

[12] Vaught, 4.

[13] Vaught, 44-45.

growers saw themselves as "a select social group."[14] The California citrus industry embodied the ideals and missions of horticulture. It was a civilized connection to the land, and it appealed to businessmen and professionals from around the U.S (a select social group?), beckoning them to the land of warmth and wealth, to lead a life that was "at once healthful and refined" in the Mediterranean climate of Southern California.[15]

A March 1911 article in *Sunset* magazine, entitled "In The Orange Country: Where the Orchard is a Mine, the Human factor Among Gold-Bearing Trees of California,"[16] was an advertisement of this healthful and refined life. It lauded the pluck, resourcefulness and industry of the citrus ranchers, and exhibited the beauty of the groves and the citrus towns in a photographic tour of the citrus country. The author also presented citrus as industry, where the ranchers became citrus manufacturing specialists and the trees had value as production units. The growers'

---

[14] Vaught, 44-45.

[15] Kevin Starr, *Inventing The Dream: California Through the Progressive Era* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1985), 142.

[16] Walter V. Woehlke, "In The Orange Country: Where the Orchard is a Mine, the Human factor Among Gold-Bearing Trees of California," *Sunset 26,* no. 3 (March 1911): 251-264.

cooperative (CFGE) was credited by the author with making order out of market chaos, and sparking rising demand for Sunkist oranges through its advertising campaigns.[17]

Between 1900 and 1920, over 200 letters of inquiry were sent to the Redlands, California Chamber of Commerce, expressing interest in owning citrus groves.[18] These letters offer a glimpse into the perceptions that people outside the industry had formed about life as a citrus rancher in California. More than half came from the northeastern and Midwestern states and Canada, but a third of the inquiries were also sent from the less populous South and the West. It is not possible to discern which inquirers were serious about a major life change, and which were wishfully thinking out loud. "California Citrus," the idea, had certainly intrigued all of them. Perhaps they imagined themselves as being part of that select social group that Vaught described, and wanted to share in the experiences they read about in *Sunset* magazine.

---

[17] Woelhke, 251-264.

[18] Redlands Chamber of Commerce Collection, Box VII, Citrus Collection, Folder C., Letters of Inquiry, A.K. Smiley Public Library.

Industry organs such as the *California Citrograph* (CFGE), and conventions and fairs, such as the annual National Orange Show in San Bernardino, became spaces for shared experiences. A subscriber to the *Citrograph* saw ads for grove heaters, tractors, and chemicals. The ads portrayed ranchers, just like them, telling of how they had solved one problem or another, by using the advertised product. Readers could see how other ranchers like themselves were dealing with the everyday challenges of ranching. It was certainly an imagined community and a portrayal of shared experiences. Readership of the *Citrograph* in 1922 was 12,200.[19] According to Tobey and Wetherell, seventy-three percent of growers in 1921 were CFGE growers, with MOD making up another ten percent,[20] so that eighty-three percent of growers had access to imagined community through these institutions.

The National Orange Show was only one of dozens of industry fairs or "shows." In these spaces, participants

---

[19] Nelson Chesman & Co.'s, *Newspaper Rate Book* (St. Louis: Nelson Chesman & Co., 1922), 12. The "sworn average circulation" for the *Citrograph* in 1922 was 12,200. The same advertisers also patronized MOD's organ, *Citrus Leaves*, which was published in Redlands.

[20] Ronald Tobey and Charles Wetherell, "The Citrus Industry and the Revolution of Corporate Capitalism in Southern California, 1887-1944," *California History* 74, no. 1 (Spring, 1995): 8.

were able to see the community of growers and comprehend that their industry was made up of thousands like themselves. Competing districts would build exhibits that looked like floats in the annual Tournament of Roses parade. Instead of flowers, the entire exhibit was covered in oranges or lemons in intricate design patterns. As in the Orange Day celebration,[21] historical pageantry played a role in community formation.[22] The primary purpose of these shows was ostensibly to bring together the entire industry for technical presentations and seminars, and for business associates to discuss the many pressing issues of the day in their shared business. But these shows also included a celebratory element, in formal dinners and balls, and informal mingling in the amusement sections such as one would find at any county fair.[23] Attendance at the show

---

[21] See page 1.

[22] Douglas Cazaux Sackman, "By Their Fruits Ye Shall Know Them": "Nature Cross Culture Hybridization" and the California Citrus Industry, 1893-1939, *California History* 74 no. 1 (Spring, 1995): 82-99.

[23] Redlands Chamber of Commerce Collection, Box VII, Citrus Collection, Folder B., Orange Show Bills, A.K. Smiley Public Library.

during the Depression ranged from 255,000 in 1929, to 136,000 in 1939.[24]

The annual Redlands Orange Box Derby was organized by the Redlands Chamber of Commerce, and was a day of fun that also reminded the greater community that the citrus industry was the economic engine for the city. Orange crates were used to construct the racers, instead of soapboxes. 1939's event was highlighted by a personal appearance from Hollywood actor and philanthropist Leo Carillo.[25]

Through their cooperatives, growers became business partners, but they were also likely to be lodge brothers, civic leaders, and fellow church members. George Stanley, who was a lemon grower in Corona himself, worked forty-one years for the Exchange Lemon Products Company. He was also active in the Lions Club, Toastmasters, the Garden Club,

---

[24] "Great Throng Sees Classic on Final Day," *San Bernardino Sun*, February 25, 1929; "136,230 At Show," *San Bernardino Sun*, March 27, 1939.

[25] Redlands Chamber of Commerce Collection, Box VII, Citrus Collection, Folder B., Orange Show Bills, A.K. Smiley Public Library.

the Corona Concert Association, the Library Board and the Riverside County Republican Committee.[26]

Stanley's many affiliations are a testament to his civic-mindedness, but they also illustrate a three-dimensional network of business, social, and political groups, wherein affiliation in one realm could be leveraged to open doors or facilitate cooperation in the other realms. For example, business colleagues at the local growers association might have found themselves working together on a community service project for their fraternal organization. If one of their lodge brothers was running for the state legislature, then their help on his campaign provided future access when they sought help with labor issues or railroad rate regulations. In this example, a circular pattern was created, where business relationships led to social networking, with political access that returned benefits to the business realm. Relationships like these are built over many years. However, such common networking can become hierarchical if other groups are excluded from access to this marketplace, based on race,

---

[26] George Stanley, Interviewed by Gloria Scott, Corona, California, November 22, 1982. Corona Public Library Oral History Project HR C-039, C-040.

class or gender. Workers were not business owners and so would not have joined the Rotary Club, nor is it likely that, based on class, they would have been asked to join fraternal lodges like The Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks. Without these sorts of informal social interactions, they would not be able to establish the personal relationships that give access to business owners and future government officials. Exclusiveness means that certain segments of society, for example Mexican Americans, would feel that they did not have this type of access to government, which threatens democratic principles and replaces faith in the social contract with disillusionment.

To this point, community formation among growers has been discussed in the context of shared experiences, including the pivotal establishment of cooperative marketing. Concrete cultural markers also engender community pride, whether they are the result of cumulative efforts to build them, or because they inspire a feeling of broad communal ownership. For example, Riverside's Mission Inn was built for the tourist trade, to house visitors who came to enjoy the Mediterranean climate, and to tour the scenic orange groves that created a landscape of wealth and

healthful living.[27] Even citizens of Riverside who could not afford to dine or stay at the Mission Inn, could recognize it as a symbol of their town and way of life. As such, it became a focal point of external validation by hosting tourists from around the country and foreign nations. It was also a favored venue for Southern Californians. Richard Nixon wed Patricia Ryan at the Inn on June 21, 1940, in the Presidential Suite. The Inn is a tangible and romantic connection to Riverside's past. Though Riverside's Loring Opera House has been lost to fire, wealthy growers were entertained by some of the biggest stars of the stage from 1890 to 1923.

The park in Redlands that contains the A.K. Smiley Library, Lincoln Shrine and Redlands Bowl, is frequently the host of events at one of these venues. Alfred and Albert Smiley - educators, humanitarians, philanthropists, and citrus growers in Redlands - donated the sixteen-acre space to the city.[28]

---

[27] Tom Patterson, *A Colony for California: Riverside's First Hundred Years*, 2nd ed. (Riverside, CA: Riverside Museum Press, 1996), 213-220.

[28] Larry E. Burgess, *Alfred Albert and Daniel Smiley: A Biography* (Redlands, CA: Beacon Printery, 1969); Phyllis C. Irshay, *The Pride and Glory of the Town: The Story of the A.K. Smiley Public Library* (Redlands, CA: City of Redlands, 1988), 10.

Many educational institutions owe their existence to citrus benefactors, among them Chaffey College in Ontario,[29] The Claremont Colleges, the University of Redlands and the University of California Riverside, a natural outgrowth of the Citrus Experiment Station. All of these institutions were founded to contribute to the community: to afford an educational experience equivalent to what the founders had experienced in the east or Midwest; also to be an economic boon, by training future businessmen, scientists, teachers, and clergy. All of them elicit community pride.

The first citrus cooperatives required communal action for survival, and, having succeeded mightily, engendered the sense of community that comes from shared risk.

The growers had a right to congratulate themselves on their successes, and a closer examination of the realities of farming citrus reveals the constant struggles and risks of being in that business. However, the growers weren't acknowledging the indispensable contribution of the workers who made the dream real, whose hands turned the plump fruit on the trees into carloads heading eastward, and income for

---

[29] The original college opened in 1885 in Ontario, the buildings now part of Chaffey High School. Chaffey College relocated to what is now Rancho Cucamonga in 1960.

the grower and his community. These workers had families, and dreams for their children too.

Labor Problem Solved — Racial Problem Created

Labor shortages in California agriculture were often relieved by the use of immigrant labor. The pattern of rejection by the non-grower white population, discussed earlier[30] could be mitigated, if those non-white workers kept on the move, following seasonal crops throughout California. This would not be the case with citrus. Different varieties and kinds of citrus could be planted to keep pickers and packers working for most of the year. Valencia oranges are harvested in the summer, roughly from June to October, and the Washington Navel orange is generally picked from December to April or May. Adding the year-round season for lemons creates a schedule with very little downtime. This produces a year-round source of income for growers, and also attracts a work force of family men, looking for a more settled life. Edward Barbo was born in Redlands in 1928 and worked with his father in the groves as a boy. If they went up into the San Joaquin

---

[30] See pp. 44-48.

Valley for work during the short citrus off seasons, Edward remembers the hard work and camping out, but when back in Redlands, life was better because it was home.[31] For Barbo, a settled life, even in modest housing, was better than a migratory life with no roots, disrupted schooling for the children, and no permanent community around them. Year-round labor availability was desired by the growers and, for the reasons given above, was desirable for worker families.

The Mexican workers who were employed in citrus were part of a migration into the U.S. that began in earnest during the Mexican Revolution of 1910-1920, but which had roots in Porfirio Diaz' programs to industrialize Mexico from 1875 to 1910, including its agriculture.[32] Many fled the fighting, but others left because of economic and social disruptions, including many who were middle and upper class. The 1910 census reports the total population of Mexican descent in the United States as over 360,000. This increased to more than 700,000 in 1920 and doubled

---

[31] Edward Barbo, Interview by Robert Gonzalez, February 14, 1995 Vol. 2, "Citrus, Labor and Community in the East San Bernardino Valley," A.K. Smiley Public Library, Redlands, California.

[32] Mario T. Garcia, *Desert Immigrants: The Mexicans of El Paso, 1880-1920* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), 33-34.

again to over 1,400,000 by 1930.[33] World War I caused a severe farm labor shortage in the U.S., and not only because millions were in uniform. The government's slogan that "Food Will Win the War" meant that an increase in food production was mandatory. War industries also drew labor away from agriculture. Concerted efforts included Women's Land Army of America units, a Boys Working Reserve, and federal labor offices, trying to mobilize all able bodies in California, and to coordinate these resources with growers. Unequal distribution of labor was causing the grower's worst nightmare: growers competing for workers. The growers knew that Mexican labor was the solution.[34] Between 1917 and 1920, over 30,000 Mexicans entered California, most of who did not register with authorities, due to the eight-dollar head tax provision of the 1917

---

[33] United States. Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930. *Abstract of the Fifteenth Census of the United States.* Washington: U.S. Govt. Printing Office, 1933. Many scholars admit to the uncertainty of numbers from this period, for a variety of reasons. Therefore, these census numbers are only a reference point to illustrate the magnitude of increase in Mexican immigration to the Southwestern U.S.; for more on this subject, see Garcia, *Desert Immigrants,* and Ricardo Romo, "Responses to Mexican Immigration, 1910-1930," *Aztlan: A Journal of Chicano Studies, UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center Press,* 6, no.2 (Summer 1975): 172-194.

[34] Vaught, *Cultivating California,* 177-184.

immigration law.[35] A December, 1919 editorial in the *Citrograph* asserts that the citrus industry was already dependent on Mexican labor.[36] The crisis of World War I, combined with restrictionist immigration legislation, had cemented California agriculture's dependence on Mexican labor for the foreseeable future.

Geographic locations influence human interactions. Put another way, landscapes are exhibits of social relations.[37] The landscapes that were occupied by Mexican immigrants demonstrated the desire of the dominant culture to contain their presence in the greater community, restricting them as much as possible to the economic role that they were invited to play in the citrus industry. These restrictions or containments applied to housing on citrus ranches, separate Mexican villages, segregated schooling, restricted access to markets and restaurants, even segregated seating in movie theaters. In an early study of a Mexican village

---

[35] Ricardo Romo, "Responses to Mexican Immigration, 1910-1930," *Aztlan: A Journal of Chicano Studies, UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center Press*, 6, no.2 (Summer 1975): 172-194. Romo estimates a total Mexican immigration of over 180,000 into the U.S., during the same 1917-1920 period, using Mexican sources.

[36] "Growth of Mexican Labor," *California Citrograph*, December 1919, 33.

[37] Matt Garcia, *A World Of Its Own: Race, Labor and Citrus in the Making of Greater Los Angeles, 1900-1970* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001), 4.

known as Arbol Verde, researcher Helen O'Brien observed that "the Mexican is economically (but not socially) a part of Claremont,"[38] that is, they were welcome to provide cheap labor, but were not welcome in mainstream American society. For example, shopping for food was only permitted at stores designated for "ethno racial minorities."[39]

Growers with ranches that were large enough and prosperous enough, housed their labor on the ranch, with schooling for the children, a company store, and community-building activities such as baseball teams or bands. These amenities were designed to appeal to the Mexican families. The benefits of a stable home life would supersede occasional higher wages from migratory work, or the temptation to go to work on another citrus ranch. Blas Coyazo worked thirty-five years for the Fairbanks Ranch in the Redlands area and he acknowledged that he may have occasionally missed a bigger payday to be had on some other ranch, but that in the long run he did better financially by staying with one employer, because he was not idle in the off seasons. He was able to work so long, because the

---

[38] Helen O'Brien, "The Mexican Colony: A Study of Cultural Change," 1-2, as quoted in Garcia, *A World of Its Own*, 71.

[39] O'Brien, as quoted in Garcia, 52.

management "protected him from the heavier work [as he got older]."[40] This last statement by Coyazo indicates that his loyal service to this grower was returned in kind, and suggests that worker-grower relations were not invariably exploitive.

The *Citrograph* ran a series of articles on citrus labor housing, authored by A.D. Shamel, Plant Physiologist for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and resident at the Citrus Experiment Station in Riverside.[41] The motive to provide such housing was certainly based on self-interest: growers wanted to reproduce their family labor force. Historian Margo McBane studied the family housing on the Limoneira Ranch at Santa Paula in Ventura County and concluded that it was part of the system of labor control that was exerted by growers. Families formed a more stable and harmonious labor force than single males, but there were other subtler benefits. Families recruited other relatives into the work force. Families who worked together

---

[40] Blas Coyazo, interviewed by Robert Gonzalez, June 30, 1994, Redlands, California Vol. 4 "Citrus, Labor and Community in the East San Bernardino Valley" A.K. Smiley Public Library, 31.

[41] The same A.D. Shamel who addressed the banquet at the Mission Inn on Orange Day (see page 3).

trained each other and maintained a sort of unit discipline in work habits.[42]

Nonetheless, if the housing was of good quality, then it also benefited the workers, intentionally or not. It reflected both the need to keep good help, and that Mexicans were indeed considered good help:

> The Mexican laborer, who has a comfortable little cottage in which he may maintain his family, is the contented man, and is less likely to be attracted by the blandishments of another 25 cents a day.[43]

The Limoneira Ranch provided photographs and floor plans for a showcase article in the May, 1920 edition of the *Citrograph*.[44] It was common to segregate the workers by race, with differing levels of housing quality for each race. An article that featured the neighboring Rancho Sespe in Fillmore, described the housing for white, married men: from four to five rooms, rented for $5 to $8 per month, with free plumbing, painting, and repairs. A photo shows a

---

[42] Margo McBane, "The Role of Gender in Citrus Employment: A Case Study of Recruitment, Labor, and Housing Patterns at the Limoneira Company, 1893 to 1940," *California History* 74, no. 1, Citriculture and Southern California (Spring, 1995): 76.

[43] "The Well Housed Employee," *California Citrograph*, September 1918, 253.

[44] A.D. Culberson, "Housing of Ranch Labor." *California Citrograph*, May 1920, 212.

fenced-in cottage, with trees and vines. For the married Mexican man, the ranch furnished a lot of about one-quarter of an acre. "The Mexicans build their own houses, sometimes with two rooms, sometimes more." The ranch management felt that this arrangement created a home-like feeling. A photo of one of these "typical [self-built] homes in the Mexican village on the Sespe Ranch," with the home-building Mexican family standing in front, bears the caption "Seven future employes in this family."[45] The cost of workers' housing was returned in the long-term benefits of having reliable and experienced workers on hand year-round, and hopefully, for a generation.

At the Chase Plantation in Corona, the dwelling for a single white male was slightly larger than that provided for an entire Mexican family. Once again, the clear message to the Mexican family was that they were of a lower class, based on their ethnicity.[46]

Outside of these exceptional arrangements, most of the Mexicans fended for themselves. If they could save enough money to buy a small plot of land, the location would

---

[45] A.D. Shamel, "Employes of California Citrus Ranches," *California Citrograph*, March 1918, 96-97.

[46] A.D.Shamel, "Housing the Employees of California Citrus Ranches," *California Citrograph*, March 1918, 86.

likely be one that no one else wanted to build on. The Arbol Verde village was built in the path of a wash running out of the nearby San Bernardino Mountains, therefore "subject to occasional flooding."[47] They were more likely to build their own homes, using whatever materials could be afforded or that were on hand. Utility services provided by the local municipal governments were limited to water and electricity. Others who were newer and could not afford their own lot would rent, and share the space with extended family or friends.[48]

An example of poor housing conditions is illustrated in conditions found in the Eastside, Casa Blanca and Arlington districts of Riverside. Leo Mott's report on the housing he found there, as inspector for the California Commission on Immigration and Housing (CCIH), rated one hundred forty-one of the one hundred eighty houses inspected, as "very bad" under the CCIH rating system. Some houses had four or five families living in them and the Casa Blanca village had no sewer service. The run down

---

[47] O'Brien, 1-2, as quoted in Garcia, 71.

[48] Gonzalez, Gilbert G. *Labor and Community: Mexican Citrus Worker Villages in a Southern California County, 1900-1950.* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1994).

neighborhoods were considered "breeding grounds for disease" that could easily "infest the other sections of the city."[49] The CCIH suggested that Riverside would do well to condemn the old, derelict houses and erect housing that would be safe and sanitary, and which could also earn rent for the city, or interest, should the new units be sold to the occupants. Otherwise, the city would attract the " . . . skum (sic) of the Mexican population of the state."[50] Using terms like "infest," or "skum," makes it clear that the priority here was to mitigate the danger to the surrounding community, and only incidentally to benefit the occupants of the overcrowded housing.

Education for Mexican immigrant children placed great emphasis on learning English, and training in vocational skills, based on commonly held beliefs that Mexican children did not have potential in academic studies, and that the boys should be trained in manual "shop" skills, and the girls in domestic skills. These segregated Mexican schools were also inferior in quality of construction, compared to the standard schools for Anglo-American

---

[49] "Mexican Situation Is Considered Here," *Riverside Enterprise*, June 17, 1924.

[50] "Mexican Situation."

children, and the Anglo teachers assigned to them were also considered to be inferior. All of these differences (deficiencies) expressed biases that the children were not equal in aptitude to white children by virtue of their ethnicity.[51]

The Mexicans clearly had the difficulties of all new immigrant groups, related to learning the language and adapting to an alien culture, but there was a deeper problem of racial stereotyping that limited assimilation. George P. Clements, Manager of the Agricultural Department of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, described the Mexican (and "oriental") as fully adapted to tasks in California agriculture, " . . . due to their crouching and bending habits . . ." and desirable in that he is never a "biological" problem, that is, he doesn't marry out of his own race.[52] He is also honest, responsible, and considerate of his employer's property. Most importantly, to Clements'

---

[51] Gilbert G. Gonzalez, *Labor and Community: Mexican Citrus Worker Villages in a Southern California County, 1900-1950* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994), 99-113; also Garcia, *Desert Immigrants*, 110-126.

[52] George P. Clements, "Mexican Immigration and Its Bearing on California's Agriculture," *California Citrograph*, November, 1929, 3, 28.

audience, California's agriculture absolutely depended on their labor.

The pattern of previous labor use in the citrus belt was being reproduced, with a new group. A cheap labor source was recruited, and their work was proven to be a major contribution to the success of the growers and to the prosperity of the community. The non-white immigrants then faced the rejection of the larger community, in the form of segregation and discrimination. Most importantly, the children learned that they were inferior in school and that, because of their skin color, they were not allowed do the same things that white children do.

Discrimination could present itself in something as simple as taking a swim on a hot summer day. In Redlands, the municipal swimming pool was known as The Sylvan Plunge. Prior to World War II, the Mexican and African American children were allowed to swim there on Mondays only. Blas Coyazo recalled that they were "chased out" about three-thirty or four o'clock in the afternoon, because the pool staff was going to drain and clean the pool. "And we went back on Tuesdays, we couldn't get in, the water was just

beautiful every day from Tuesday on."[53] Movie theaters, the skating rink, barbershops and cafes with "White Trade Only" signs posted in the window, were all blatant acts of restriction of and discrimination against Mexican immigrants and Mexican Americans alike. Eunice Romero Gonzalez remembered more subtle forms of prejudice, such as prices "being hoisted a little more when you were a different color"[54] and the unavailability of better jobs. Blatant discriminatory acts, segregated schools and restrictions on upward mobility in the citrus industry sent powerful and degrading messages to the Mexicans living in their villages.

A rigid structure of containment and restriction faced Mexican immigrants and their children, and any Mexican Americans who worked and lived in the same spaces.[55] The workers were hired to fill a specific economic role in the specialty crop agricultural system. Housing and schooling[56] were intended to reproduce generations of citrus workers,

---

[53] Blas Coyazo, 26

[54] Eunice Romero Gonzalez, interviewed by Robert Gonzalez July 8, 1994 Redlands, California. Vol. 8 "Citrus and Community in the East San Bernardino Valley" A.K. Smiley Public Library, 34.

[55] Garcia, *A World of Their Own*, 74-75.

[56] Garcia, 68.

who would presumably be happy living in segregated housing, and whose children would be satisfied with schooling that prepared the boys for manual labor and the girls for domestic or other gender-specific work, such as being a seamstress. In villages all across Southern California, Mexicans, by nationality or descent, faced these daunting conditions by first finding strength and support in a community.

Always a Sense of Community

Mexican immigrants came to California in search of a better economic future. Those who found work in the citrus groves of Riverside and San Bernardino counties had the opportunity to live a fairly settled life, compared to those who followed a seasonal migratory cycle. Nonetheless, they inhabited the same class structure, which preferred them in a subservient role, economically and socially. The Mexican citrus workers were largely unwelcome outside their villages, but from that exclusion, community was created in the spaces left to them, and bonds were forged that would later help to break the grip of prejudice in the community at large.[57]

---

[57] Alamillo, *Making Lemonade Out of Lemons*, 142-167.

A community may be imagined when the group rises above differences and recognizes their cultural roots. Mexican immigrants came to the citrus ranches from diverse locations in their country. Rather than carry those differences into their present circumstances, they drew closer together based on their commonalities of cultural origins and the common enemy of prejudice. Community was built through familial, cultural and economic relationships, in the spaces of home, neighborhood, church, leisure, and work.

Family events create and embody a sense of community. The Mexican family also provided a cultural bulwark in an alien, and at times, hostile environment. Family included more than immediate kin, it also meant extended family as well as the custom of *compadrazgo*, or god-parentage. This system provided mutual support, the next circle outside of kin. In "upheaval and migration," these ties need to take the place of actual blood ties.[58] Women particularly felt the absence of their mothers and sisters, who were their immediate support in raising their children in their home villages in Mexico.

---

[58] Weber, *Dark Sweat, White Gold,* 57.

Rose Ramos remembered another tradition that was brought from Mexico, the charitable work done in the village by the *Cruz Azul* (Blue Cross), a *mutualista* (aid) society with origins in Mexico. They provided benefits to indigent people, such as burial for those with no family or without unemployment relief.[59] Mutual aid societies burgeoned with the increase in immigration, and though they charged nominal dues, perhaps $2 per month, the obligations were not treated as legally binding, but rather as a moral obligation of reciprocity.[60] In what might be called their highest form, these societies engendered cohesiveness in the immigrant settlements, providing structure and leadership.[61]

Culturally specific events such as *tardeadas* (informal gatherings, often on a Sunday afternoon) *quinceaneras* (the fifteenth birthday and coming out party for young women), and *jamaicas* (street fairs), further reinforce ties among people with common roots. Many of these family events would

---

[59] Rose Ramos, interviewed by Robert Gonzalez June 22, 1994, Redlands California. Vol. 16 "Citrus, Labor and Community in the East San Bernardino Valley" A.K. Smiley Public Library.

[60] Weber, 61.

[61] Mario Garcia, 223.

take place in the home, where music, laughter and people often spilled out into the yards.

Cinco de Mayo celebrations were more formalized expressions of Mexican culture and solidarity, which included parades, speeches, performances, and dances. Jose Alamillo described the significance of this expression of ethnic pride in Corona, on May 5, 1936. Corona was celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of its founding, with a historical pageant portraying the settlement of the citrus colony by European Americans. The Mexican Americans chose *Cinco de Mayo* as *their* way to celebrate Corona's birthday.[62] In this instance, historical pageantry was enacted by each culture separately. The dominant society did not prohibit alternative pageantry, possibly because it did not specifically challenge the dominant society's "story."[63]

The Mexican citrus workers formed a common bond, simply by working with each other in the groves, and in the leisure activities that workingmen pursue: sports teams,

---

[62] Alamillo, 12.

[63] David Glassberg, *American Historical Pageantry* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990).

the pool hall, and saloons. These venues also provided spaces where the men could network, to find out where the jobs were and who was paying good wages.

The Mexican citrus worker community was not monolithic, and different experiences naturally yielded different memories and attitudes about that time; some of these occurred along generational, religious and economic lines. Over time, the first generation of immigrants came to feel an entitlement to the jobs they held, and saw newcomers as competition for supplemental picking work in the walnut groves during citrus off seasons. These newcomers were referred to as "Texas Mexicans," based on their residence in the El Paso area for their first few years in the United States.[64] Another type of generational difference developed between first generation Mexicans and their children. The second generation, having been born in the U.S., and bilingual, were more able and willing to adapt to the dominant culture. As teenagers, they wanted to go to movies and dances with their friends, to move about in the world around them, and to do the things that other young Americans did. Tradition-minded parents would be

---

[64] Garcia, 74.

restrictive, especially of their daughters. For example, it was forbidden for a young Mexican American woman to go out at night without a chaperone. The family's standing in the community depended on the purity of its women.[65] Tensions between tradition and the expectations of young Mexican American women were particularly manifested in personal appearance and behavior toward young men. But within these bounds, young Mexican Americans could begin to see themselves as part of the larger community.

The vast majority of Mexicans were Catholic, and churches also provided community dances and movies (with no restrictions on where anyone could sit!).[66] Not all Mexicans were Catholic. Armando Lopez recalled the division on the north side of Redlands, based on religion. The Catholic priest forbade the Mexican children from going to the House of Neighborly Service, a youth club started by the Presbyterian Church. The club was designed to appeal to

---

[65] Frances Aldama Martinez, "Corona As I Remember," *Hispanic Centennial Review*, 1886-1986 (Corona Public Library, Corona, California, 1986), 1; Vicki L. Ruiz, *From Out of the Shadows: Mexican Women in Twentieth Century America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 51-52.

[66] Ruiz, 66-67.

them with recreational, cultural and educational programs,[67] but also had designs on converting Catholic children to the Presbyterian faith. Gilbert Rey discussed the competition between the Presbyterian and Catholic religions in the north side and sums up what he thinks establishes the better path (to success):

> Many of the Hispanic people in Redlands that came from that original group [of Presbyterians or Presbyterian converts] went on to higher education, became graduates of colleges and universities, and many became professionals and that was very, very noticeable in comparison to Hispanics of the Catholic persuasion. [68]

This sentiment illustrates a dichotomy within the Mexican community. Rey implies that his success was attributable to his leaving the Catholic Church for the Presbyterian denomination. Vicki Ruiz describes a Methodist-run settlement house in El Paso that was founded in 1912. After failing to gain many converts, the Houchen Settlement returned to focusing on providing social services, such as medical care.[69]

---

[67] Armando Lopez, interviewed by Robert Gonzalez February 9, 1995 Redlands, California. Vol. 14 "Citrus, Labor and Community in the East San Bernardino Valley" A.K. Smiley Public Library.

[68] Gilbert Rey, interviewed by Robert Gonzalez February 2, 1995, Redlands, California. Vol. 17 "Citrus, Labor and Community in the East San Bernardino Valley" A.K. Smiley Public Library.

[69] Ruiz, 33.

Memories of a good life among the citrus trees seem to be directly related to the quality of the relationship between grower and worker, and to the economic status of the working family. Oddie Martinez' father managed groves for the Langford family, so that they lived on the ranch. They never lacked food, even in the Great Depression. Their father's managerial role afforded a stability that allowed them to keep animals, improving their diet and outlook on life.[70] Eunice Romero Gonzalez' father was the *majordomo* or manager of the Fairbanks ranch. Eunice did not make a living in the groves, and perhaps because of it, has warm memories of life on the ranch, a life without the sweat or the financial worries that accompany any farm business, for grower or worker.[71]

Just as the Mexican community was not monolithic, neither was there a solid wall of discrimination or uniform support for it. Joe Herrera experienced discrimination, but also saw a voice raised against it. Joe was refused service at a café, and when his employer heard about, he confronted

---

[70] Oddie Martinez, interviewed by Robert Gonzalez April 18, 1994 Redlands, California. Vol. 15 "Citrus, Labor and Community in the East San Bernardino Valley" A.K. Smiley Public Library.

[71] Eunice Romero Gonzalez, 3.

the people at the café. Joe's employer was Frank Gunter, a grower who also happened to be the mayor of Redlands. Gunter's simple reply to "white trade only," was to mingle both his and Herrera's money on the counter, and to then tell the café owner to try and separate Herrera's money from his. After determining that Herrera was not drunk or disorderly, Gunter threatened to close that business down. "I don't tolerate this kind of business while I'm mayor."[72]

This story suggests that not all members of the dominant society supported discriminatory acts, and that a few were willing to challenge the bigotry underlying such discrimination. Joe Herrera remembered this story, more than fifty years later. Community divisions begin to heal when these practices are challenged.

Repatriation and Americanization

As the Depression widened and deepened, jobs became scarce and what jobs could be found paid less for the same work. In desperate times, people and their governments act on fears. One of these fears was that illegal aliens were taking jobs and using social services that should be given

---

[72] Joe Herrera, interviewed by Robert Gonzalez April 4, 1994, Redlands California. Vol. 13 "Citrus, Labor and Community in the East San Bernardino Valley" A.K. Smiley Public Library.

to white Americans. An example of acting on these fears was an ill-conceived strategy that was implemented in Los Angeles. The goal was to leverage the fear of deportation in order to scare illegal aliens into flight, especially the criminal element.[73] Charles Visel was the head of the local committee of business and civic leaders, formed to decrease unemployment. Visel hoped to create a climate of fear that would motivate "aliens"[74] to leave on their own. Visel's press release was misinterpreted and embellished by local newspapers, especially statements about a Bureau of Immigration investigation. A Bureau supervisor discovered the fallacy of Visel's premise that 20,000 deportable aliens resided in Los Angeles, but still added to the tensions by denying civil rights to detainees.[75]

Repatriations took three forms: voluntary, involuntary (deportation by the Bureau of Immigration), and organized returns supported by welfare bureaus. Many who left

---

[73] Abraham Hoffman, "Stimulus to Repatriation: The 1931 Federal Deportation Drive and the Los Angeles Mexican Community," *Pacific Historical Review*, 42, no. 2 (May, 1973): 205-219; Matt Garcia, *A World Of Its Own*, 95.

[74] T.H. Watkins, *The Hungry Years: A Narrative History of the Great Depression in America* (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1999), 399. Watkins notes, " . . . in the Southwest, the word 'alien' was synonymous with 'Mexican.'"

[75] Hoffman, 210, 212.

voluntarily did so to avoid violence.[76] From 1931 to 1934, approximately 13,000 Mexicans and Mexican Americans were repatriated from Los Angeles County, 2,000 from Orange County, and over 3,000 people from Riverside and San Bernardino counties.[77] Hoffman estimated that 450,000 repatriates left the country from 1929-1939,[78] and later studies place the number at more than one million.[79]

Citrus growers in California were against wholesale removal of their work force and tried to cool repatriation "fever" by characterizing Mexican labor as migratory, returning to homes in Mexico after the harvest. This of course was not true of citrus workers, and was the antithesis of the growers' desire for a settled, reliable, and readily available labor source.[80]

Americanization collapsed as a result of repatriation and the Depression. School boards and growers alike needed

---

[76] Ngai, *Impossible Subjects*, 73.

[77] Matt Garcia, 108.

[78] Abraham Hoffman, "Mexican Repatriation Statistics: Some Suggested Alternatives to Carey McWilliams," *Western Historical Quarterly* 3, no. 4 (Oct., 1972): 391-404.

[79] Francisco Balderrama and Raymond Rodriguez, *Decade of Betrayal: Mexican Repatriation in the 1930s* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1995).

[80] Garcia, 108-109.

to cut their budgets, and Mexicans realized that rather than being integrated, they were now considered a burden on American society. After years of being taught how to act like Americans and to be like Americans, one can only imagine the sense of bewilderment and betrayal that the Mexican students felt, when the lesson of what America was really like, hit home.[81]

The reduced demand for citrus fruit and consequent downward pressure on prices, worked its way back to the ranches, reducing the earning potential of the pickers and packers. Picking for a given day depended on the marketing orders from back East, and so a job might last only part of a day, or only for a few days in a given week.[82] When wages got so low that families could not earn enough to eat, conditions were ripe for union organizing and for strikes to break out. When citrus workers struck, they met organized and fierce resistance from the growers, who were well organized under the guidance and funding of the Associated Farmers. The strikers needed the support and solidarity of their communities more than ever.

---

[81] Gonzalez, 73, 133, 217n81.

[82] Blas Coyazo, 13.

Communities Clash

An example of how damaging the Depression was on prices and farm wages can be found in the California cotton industry. The price of cotton dropped from 20 cents a pound in 1927, to 6 cents a pound in 1932. Wages decreased commensurately, from $1.50 per hundred pounds picked, in 1929, to forty cents per hundredweight in 1932.[83] Paul Taylor wrote of the cotton strike:

> As the faulting of the earth exposes its strata and reveals its structure, so a social disturbance throws into bold relief the structure of society, the attitudes, reactions and interests of its groups.[84]

Taylor's words could easily have been applied to any of the farm labor strikes in the state in the 1930s, except that the strike in the San Joaquin Valley resulted in four dead and many wounded, as primarily Mexican workers fought local law enforcement and strikebreakers to a standstill.[85] North Orange County became the battleground in the largest citrus workers strike in Southern California, over a six-week

---

[83] Watkins, *The Hungry Years*, 410.

[84] Paul Taylor, *On the Ground in the Thirties* (Salt Lake City: Peregrine Books, 1983), 17.

[85] Weber, 97-102.

period in June and July of 1936.[86] The most notable citrus strike in the inland counties of Riverside and San Bernardino, was the strike called by the United Cannery, Packing, Agricultural, and Allied Workers of America (UCAPAWA), against the Jameson Packing House in Corona, in 1941.[87]

In the aftermath of the Orange County strike the CFGE, Mutual Orange Distributors (MOD), and American Fruit Growers cooperatives formed the Agricultural Producers Labor Committee (APLC),[88] in order to thwart any attempts by UCAPAWA to organize the packinghouse workers. Their strategy was to form company unions, through which the workers could seek redress of grievances. These transparent tools of management were soon abandoned by workers for legitimate representation.[89]

The National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) of 1935, also known as the Wagner Act, excluded farm workers from its establishment of collective bargaining rights, but not

---

[86] Gonzalez, 135-160; see also Carey McWilliams, "The Rise of Farm Fascism: Gunkist Oranges," in *Factories In The Field* (Santa Barbara: Peregrine, 1971), 249-254.

[87] Alamillo, 123-241.

[88] Alamillo, 125.

[89] Alamillo, 125.

canning and packing workers, who were considered to be industrial. A case challenging this distinction was brought against the North Whittier Heights Citrus Association in 1937, seeking a ruling that would disallow their exemption from the Wagner Act for fruit packing workers. In 1940, the California Ninth District Court ruled against the exemption and in favor of the organized workers.[90]

UCAPAWA was successful in winning approval at the Jameson packinghouse, by a 54-14 vote, in July of 1940. The new union faced immediate opposition by the Corona Citrus Growers Association (CCGA), in the form of an anti-picketing ordinance passed by the Corona City Council.[91] Associated Farmers was organized as a reaction to the 1933 cotton strike, supported by large contributions from bankers and industrialists. Their strategy was to defeat the organizing of farm workers in any shape or form, and to break unions and strikes throughout California. Among their tactics was "localism," an attempt to invalidate union organizing by claiming that the local workers were being

---

[90] National Labor Relations Board," *In The Matter of North Whittier Heights Citrus Association and Citrus Packing House Workers Union No. 21091,"* Case No. C-310 Vol. 10, no. 113, 1269-1298.

[91] Alamillo, 127-128.

duped by outside agitators, who were most likely Communists, who espoused foreign political ideas.[92]

The Jameson Company refused to meet with the union, and after six months of stalling, the union declared a strike on February 27, 1941. In a case of community in action, the local baseball team used the baseball leagues as a network to urge workers in the region to honor the strike, and not come to Corona as strikebreakers.

The strike reinforced classes and divided the town. Italian employees took the side of management and crossed the picket line. The Mexicans felt especially betrayed by this action, because they believed that the Italians were "motivated by the promises and privileges of whiteness."[93]

Workers did not walk out from the nearby Foothill Ranch, which housed its workers free of charge, and offered other benefits such as company store credit, a community center and recreational facilities. Consequently, there was less to be gained by unionization there, and it did not succeed. Further, Foothill increased bonus payments and

---

[92] Nelson A. Pichardo, "The Power Elite and Elite-Driven Countermovements: The Associated Farmers of California during the 1930s." *Sociological Forum*, 10, no.1 (March 1995) 21-49.

[93] Alamillo, 137.

improved conditions, a clear, though indirect, victory for the workers. This practice of using benefits to influence workers may be called paternalistic, but it may also be described as good business. The growers at Foothill firmly believed that decent housing on the ranch would keep the male head of the family "at home," since he did not then need to worry about keeping a roof over his family's heads. Fear of losing not just the job, but also the home, proved sufficient to keep the union out of that ranch. Foothill made further efforts to keep the workers quarantined on the ranch by offering recreation and entertainment on site. Those workers had little desire to go to town anyway, since they had become "scabs" in the eyes of the pro-union workers.[94]

Despite these divisions, the strike against the Jameson packinghouse held for twenty-four days, but on March 21, picketers pelted a police car with rocks, hitting one officer in the head. The police moved in and arrested forty-nine picketers and charged them with disturbing the peace, inciting a riot, unlawful assembly, and aggravated

---

[94] Alamillo, 128-134.

assault with a deadly weapon.[95] In the ensuing trial, an all-Anglo jury acquitted all but four of the picketers. Manual Martinez was convicted of assaulting a deputy sheriff with a club and sentenced to concurrent five-year sentences at San Quentin state prison.[96]

The strike highlighted divisions within the entire Corona citrus community and the conflicts within factions, as each person weighed loyalties to their employers, fellow workers, and to their families and friends. Women participated and supported, but filled no leadership roles. In the end, the effort to unionize the citrus industry failed, but by mounting a serious challenge to the power of the growers, the Mexican American community learned valuable lessons in organizing strategies and tactics, and gained the confidence needed to effect real changes in the advancement of their civil rights in the post-war period, including getting the first Mexican American elected to the Corona City Council in 1958.[97]

---

[95] "Charges Filed Against 49 Alleged Rioters," *Riverside Daily Press*, March 27,1941.

[96] Alamillo, 135-137.

[97] Alamillo, 167.

The growers maintained their solidarity and succeeded in keeping the union out, but needed the active support of the city government, law enforcement, and the mainstream media to do so. Their strategies were driven by fear: first, to characterize union organizers as outside agitators who either intimidate workers into joining or mislead them with unrealistic expectations, and promises that can't be fulfilled; second, to create an atmosphere of impending violence and anarchy in the community, such that, hundreds of local growers and other citizens are sworn in as armed deputies for undefined emergencies;[98] third, framing the allegations and emergency preparations as "news stories" in the local newspapers to promote fear and to generate support among the town and county population.[99]

Growers Response

CFGE President Charles C. Teague's statements concerning the 1941 strike in Ventura County claim that the strike, during which six thousand citrus workers walked out

---

[98] "125 Deputized To Guard Groves," *Corona Daily Independent*, February 4, 1929.

[99] "County On Guard Against Possible Labor Agitation: 200 Officers Will Protect Groves in Event of Red Flareup," *Corona Daily Independent*, November 28, 1933.

countywide,[100] was the sole mark in an unblemished relationship with his employees. He believed that innocent workers were simply ill advised: "I am not opposed to organized labor but I am unalterably opposed to exploitation of workers by irresponsible labor leaders." [101] Clearly, the fact that the workers continued to organize and strike was not based on bad advice from outsiders, but on a persistent need for a living wage.

The tone goes from paternalistic to threatening, when the vice president of the Associated Farmers, C.E. Hawley, describes the purpose and necessity of the new organization to thwart agricultural strikes, such as the one that was occurring in Orange County at that very moment, because such strikes were part of a Communist plan to overthrow the American government. In an article published in the June, 1936 *Citrograph*, Hawley states that the Associated Farmers was not alone in its fight, that it was "shoulder to shoulder" with the American Legion and the American Federation of Labor (AF of L). Hawley closes with the

---

[100] Michael R. Belknap, "The Era of the Lemon: A History of Santa Paula, California." *California Historical Society Quarterly* 47, no.2 (June, 1968): 127.

[101] Charles C. Teague, *Fifty Years A Rancher* (Los Angeles: Anderson & Ritchie: The Ward Ritchie Press, 1944), 148.

remark: "The present situation is more dangerous than at any other time in the history of the state."[102] The violence orchestrated by the Associated Farmers in Orange County in June and July of 1936 was not surprising, in light of the threat described by Hawley.[103] These two statements embody the growers' response. The workers, who want to work, are victims of manipulation by outside agitators, who are known to be Communists and whose master plan is the overthrow of the government of the United States. It was unfortunate, that in such overheated rhetoric, growers could not or did not want to see that, Communist or not, from outside or inside, "agitators" and organizers can not succeed if the workers feel that they are being treated fairly by their employers. These strikes, and the growers' responses to them exposed deep fault lines between the communities of growers and the communities of workers, ostensibly their "children," based on paternalistic policies. The strikebreaking tactics described herein were more like corporal punishment administered by a very stern father.

---

[102] C.E. Hawley, "Associated Farmers of California Is Formed For Mutual Protection," *California Citrograph*, June 1936, 298-299.

[103] McWilliams, 249-254.

Frank Stokes was a grower from Covina, California, who read the biased newspaper accounts of the unequal battle that was waged by the growers and their forces, against the Mexican pickers in Orange County, in the summer of 1936. He wrote an article, published in the December 19, 1936 issue of *The Nation*, shaming the growers for cracking down on workers, for doing the very thing that had saved the growers themselves – organizing in order to get fair payment for their asset, which is labor.[104] Stokes was only one man, possibly representing many other growers who were afraid to speak up, for fear of ostracism by their community, or of being branded as communist sympathizers. Stokes' challenge of discrimination, like Frank Gunter in Redlands, was a first step in a long journey.

Conclusion

The cooperatives were the primary structure of economic organizing in the citrus grower communities. A community of growers could be imagined through industry institutions such as the *Citrograph*, and real connections could be made at events such as the National Orange Show.

---

[104] Frank Stokes, "Let the Mexicans Organize!" *The Nation*, 143, no.25 (December 19, 1936), 731-732.

Growers broadened and deepened their networks by building relationships in fraternal, civic, and political organizations. In the groves, cheap labor was needed on a continuous, even a permanent basis. The growers came to rely on Mexican immigrant and Mexican American workers, but growers and the greater communities sought to segregate this group socially. The citrus workers found, through the limited spaces available to them, the ability to create their own communities, just as the growers had done, only separately. Their communities were formed around common cultural roots, family, and their economic class.

These two groups continued to lead separate lives based on class and ethnicity. Flare-ups over wages occurred through the 1930s, but little changed in the basic system of labor usage. The hardships of the Depression had a dampening effect on the social and economic mobility of Mexican immigrants and Mexican Americans employed in the citrus industry. Mobility seems a distant dream when survival becomes paramount.

CHAPTER THREE

CONCLUSIONS

Imagined Communities

In *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism,*[1] Benedict Anderson describes nationalism as an imagined or perceived commonality with deep cultural roots. As has been shown in this study, the workers of Mexican descent maintained many aspects of their cultural heritage after immigration, especially the family unit, at work and in their village life. The growers made a direct transference of Euro American culture from the east and the Midwest, reshaping the landscapes into American citrus towns. Although most members in the imagined community will never know most of their fellows, the image of this commonality persisted in the minds of growers and workers. Neither group was socially or economically monolithic, yet they generally observed a broad, horizontal comradeship. Because Anderson's theory is about imagined

---

[1] Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism,* rev. ed. (London: Verson, 1991).

community leading to nationalism, not all of it applies to the citrus industry, but some very important elements do.

Broad, Horizontal Comradeship

In the citrus strikes of the 1930s, mostly Mexican and Mexican American workers put their livelihoods and lives at risk by the very act of organizing for better wages. In union language, this broad, horizontal comradeship is called solidarity. Even small gatherings of workers in the camps were harassed and attacked by the representatives of the economic, social, and political power structure, under the guise of fighting Communist influence. It is possible that many of the vigilantes truly believed that they were defending their way of life, albeit one that was dependent on the continued powerlessness of large numbers of other people. Media control and the arrests of so-called vagrants reinforced solidarity with the growers' cause. Faced with marginalization and containment even in good times, the Mexican workers drew on the culture of their common national origins, and on the bonds formed by the shared dangers of the present, to reinforce what was in that space and time, real community. During the labor conflicts, the fluid spaces between opposing groups offered images of the other. Each group's self-image was defined by what they

opposed, reflected in the faces of armed strikebreakers and police, or the faces of picketing workers, challenging their status as powerless cogs.

Creole Elite

Anderson observes that a national or community consciousness emerges when the members of the subject group, even a "creole elite," recognize the limitations of their position vis a vis the metropole. There is a dawning realization by the leaders of the subgroup that reliance on the metropole will never result in power being granted or shared. When that moment of clarity arrives, the assertion of power is the only course to take. In the 1890s, the California citrus growers saw that they would never prosper by reliance on the existing market system, dictated by the interests of eastern fruit buyers. They were headed to ruin, and so they acted to ensure their common survival by organizing into local and regional cooperative marketing organizations. In doing so, they reclaimed control of their economic lives. It was a stroke for self-determination. The "coops" had claimed power.

Sadly, the descendents of those growers denied their own workers that same self-determination that in the 1930s could only be gained by organizing. The painful irony was

lost on many, but not all of the growers, such as Frank Stokes.[2] The growers were ultimately able to suppress the strikes and prevent the establishment of organized field labor, a consummation still decades away. In the end, the labor unrest and the militant responses it provoked, only served to harden the separation between these groups.

Census, Map and Museum

Anderson discusses three institutions of colonizing power: census, map, and museum. A census is an imposed characterization of the people, from "above," or from outside. It serializes groups, that is, it puts them into a proper and systematic order. The census is used to keep track of who should be paying taxes, and of who can be conscripted. If we substitute dominant society or growers for colonizing power, then we can illustrate census as an institution of power in the citrus industry. Growers who were large enough to employ labor directly, sought to serialize them, to place them into a proper and systematic order. Housing on the Limoneira Ranch in Santa Paula, or at

---

[2] Frank Stokes, "Let the Mexicans Organize!" *The Nation*, 143, no.25 (December 19, 1936), 731-732.

the Chase Plantation in Corona, segregated workers based on class and race, to establish hierarchies and control.

Maps classify territory, and were used by new rulers to put their European neighbors on notice that they had "inherited" the kingdom of a deposed or subjugated king - "reconstructing the property-history of their new possession."[3] Growers put their stamp on the landscape of the citrus belt, imposing their economic and social order, backed with political power.

Colonial powers built museums in their colonies, for more than just scientific curiosity. Museums have political, social, and anthropological purposes: exhibits of past glories notify the natives that they are not capable of such greatness, but that the colonizing power is capable. This paucity of capabilities in one people is contrasted by the colonizing power that has the ability and desire to turn a desert into a garden, or an orange grove.

Commonalities

Growers and workers each exhibited the traits of community formation that have been described in the three components of Anderson's theory, submitted above. They just

---

[3] Anderson, 174.

did so separately. Commonalities between growers and workers are found in each group's *pursuit* of community formation, not in common efforts to build a greater community. Each group aspired to a sense of community, based on their own cultures, experiences and socio-economic position. The growers understood and displayed broad, horizontal comradeship through their cooperative organization and among their neighbors, while the workers sought the same class comradeship through efforts to organize for collective bargaining, and also within their villages.

The concept of a creole cadre or elite was discussed in the introduction to Chapter Two. It was seen that both groups recognized that in order to prosper, they needed to take control of their own destiny. Growers prospered mightily by their assertion of power in the marketplace, but it must be said that when the workers sought some commensurate control by organizing, the erstwhile revolutionary growers became the oppressors.

The asymmetry of power in the grower-worker relationship is thrown into stark relief by census (serialization), maps (cultural landscapes), and museums (demonstration of capabilities that are unavailable to the

subject group). This is a discouragingly one-sided relationship in all aspects of life, unless the workers can form their own communities, in which they pool their familial, cultural, and economic resources for mutual support. And that is what the Mexican and Mexican American workers did.[4]

Citrus Economy

While it is true that the two groups shared some of the same spaces, yet lived separate lives, the culprit for separateness is not automatically racism. Gilbert Gonzalez believes that the Mexican experience in America should not be viewed solely through the lens of race. It is necessary to understand the place in the economic system that the Mexican workers held, and to include that context when judging their overall experience.[5]

The place that the Mexican immigrants held in the American economic system as citrus workers, is the same place that many immigrants hold when they land on the

---

[4] Matt Garcia, *A World of Its Own: Race, Labor and Citrus in the Making of Greater Los Angeles, 1900-1970* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001), 69.

[5] Gilbert G. Gonzalez, *Labor and Community: Mexican Citrus Worker Villages in a Southern California County*, (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994)

shores of this country: the bottom rung on the ladder. The immigrant usually leaves behind dismal possibilities in their country of birth and makes the leap of faith that life will be better here than it was there. New immigrants, particularly unskilled labor will take what work they can get, grasping the bottom rung on the economic ladder. There is a period of time, perhaps one generation, more or less, when the first arrivals are paving the way for a better life for their children. So in a purely economic sense, the experience of Mexican immigrants is a Southwestern version of the experiences of immigrants to the industrial Northeast.[6] Those northeastern newcomers came from eastern and southern Europe in the latter half of the nineteenth century, through the start of the First World War.

There the similarity of experience ends, because "foreignness" became a racialized concept for Mexican immigrants, and even for Mexican Americans.[7] In some instances, this concept took form in poll taxes or deed restrictions. Most commonly, it took shape in segregated

---

[6] David Brody, *Steelworkers in America: The Nonunion Era* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1960).

[7] Mae M. Ngai, *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 132.

living areas (on ranches or in villages), and in pervasive discrimination, where Mexican children were not allowed to swim with white children, nor sit in the center section of the movie theater.[8] In contrast, a path to "whiteness" was eventually opened for the children of immigrants from eastern and southern Europe, such as the Italians in Corona.[9]

An overlooked reason for the separation between white growers and Mexican workers is the structure of the citrus business itself. A large grower such as the Limoneira Ranch in Santa Paula, run by C.C. Teague, had 1,850 acres of lemons. If each acre holds approximately 100 trees, and lemons produce fruit year-round, Limoneira needs to keep labor close at hand throughout the year, to pick the fruit from those 185,000 trees.[10] With that large of a crop, it makes sense to provide housing on-site, if the resources are available to do so. The owner of such a large

---

[8] Ngai, 132.

[9] Jose M. Alamillo, *Making Lemonade Out of Lemons: Mexican American Labor and Leisure in a California Town, 1880-1960* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press: 2006), 137.

[10] Michael R. Belknap, "The Era of the Lemon: A History of Santa Paula, California," *California Historical Society Quarterly* 47, no.2 (June, 1968): 113-140

enterprise would not personally supervise the picking, so there was minimal interaction even with permanently housed labor, but some familiarity would develop over a number of years. Small ranchers had no such resources. Their labor demand was aggregated by the local fruit exchange packinghouse, which then brought in and supervised the workers, with little to no involvement required on the part of the grower. When men work together and share satisfaction in a job well done, an opportunity for friendship develops, no matter their respective races or classes. It must be remembered however, that citrus is a specialty crop. For the most part, the sorts of social interactions that would put a human face on the pickers, for the growers, would not happen because the fruit exchange was set up for efficiency and profit. This is the paradoxical nature of the citrus industry: labor usage on small ten acre ranches brought no more substantial interactions between growers and workers than did the labor usage on the Limoneira Ranch.

By learning about citrus, the business, we remove the veil of romance, and see the harsh realities that apply to both growers and workers. All growers, no matter the crop, are subject to the whims of nature and the vagaries of the

market place. Farmers mark time by traumatic natural events: droughts, floods, and freezes, to name but a few. The freeze of 1937 involved the workers, and other members of the greater community, who were enlisted in the all-out efforts to save the orange crop. But it was the growers who were fully invested, and many lost a large proportion of their crop, while expending significant resources on the labor and oil required to keep the grove heaters fired up. These were the risks that the growers took. The workers were affected if there was less picking work due to the loss from a freeze, but by and large, the grower bore this risk alone.

From the grower's perspective, they were providing jobs, incurring the perpetual costs of care and cultivation, and taking the risks. From a capitalist's standpoint, they were therefore entitled to as much profit as they could make during the good years.

The workers also took risks. They were not guaranteed income. They may or may not be able to get unemployment relief, and in the early years of the Depression, may have been asked to leave the country. Repatriation has a non-threatening sound to it, and it literally means to be restored to one's own home or country. On the ground

however, it meant uprooting the lives of families, with no guarantees that any sort of work was available back in their home villages. These were people who aspired to be Americans, and many who *were* Americans.

The realities of life for the grower and worker were not post card material. No orange crate label displayed the pall of black smoke that hung over Redlands in January 1937, after three days of "smudging," nor depicted the violence and repression visited upon the citrus workers who struck in Orange County in July of 1936. The labor unrest of the 1930s, and the violent responses by growers, backed up by law enforcement, removed even more of the romantic facade of citrus culture as a genteel way of life. The public reasons given by the growers and the Associated Farmers, in fighting union organizing, were that at best, outside agitators were disrupting a generally happy workforce, and that at worst, Communist influence through unions had the intent of subversion of the government.[11]

As businessmen, profit was a top priority, but not the only one. In the 1930s, most of the growers were the sons

---

[11] see Hawley remarks, p.100.

and grandsons of growers, cultivating the same trees that were planted by their forefathers and carrying on the family ranching business. It has been shown that income in the citrus industry was cut in half in 1933. Union organizing and walkouts would logically be seen as existential threats in a time when consumers had less buying power while fruit production continued to rise. The growers were being squeezed between a weak market and demands for higher wages. During the citrus strikes of 1936 and 1941, violence erupted in confrontations between strikers and strikebreakers, and between strikers and vigilantes. If the strikers had been able to enforce a work stoppage, the situation would have become critical, with perishable fruit left hanging on the trees, or, picked but waiting to be packed and shipped. The loss of a crop *is* an existential threat to a farmer.

Historians have theorized about the concept of "industrialized agriculture." What defines it and where does it fit on the continuum of American economic life? Did it evolve in response to externalities or was it a catalyst for change in other aspects of our society? From this brief and limited study of citriculture in Southern California, the answers to these questions are that two external forces

played major roles in this evolution: technological advancements and population movements. Mechanized cultivation, rail and steamship transport, and wire communications were pivotal to the success of California's specialty crops, as was the exploitation of migrant labor. Whether they were Chinese, Mexican, or Southwestern (Dust Bowl) migrants from within the U.S, these workers made intensive farming profitable for the growers, as they moved into the area, or were purposely brought in.

Processing and packing is naturally more adaptable to industrial methods. The legal basis for fighting union organizing in citrus packinghouses was removed along with the exemption that the NLRB had given to agricultural packing and canning. Tobey and Wetherell believe that the CFGE's success was based on managerial capitalism, and that citrus was not an agricultural, but rather an industrial enterprise, selected by a modernizing elite to drive Southern California's development in the twentieth century.[12] An alternative view, and the one supported by this study, holds that agricultural economics are different

---

[12] Ronald Tobey and Charles Wetherell, "The Citrus Industry and the Revolution of Corporate Capitalism in Southern California, 1887-1944" *California History* 74, no.1 (Spring 1995): 6-21.

from manufacturing in two key ways. First, that agricultural production cannot be precisely managed like manufacturing production can. Inputs can be managed, but nature will have some influence on the outputs, even more so when "production units" take years to start producing and can die from climatic or biological causes. Second, agriculture relies on government intervention.[13] Long before all of California's citrus growers came under the AAA's prorate program, they all benefited from high tariffs. It is safe to say that without the tariff, there would not have been a protected market to which prorated shipments could be sent.

Furthermore, CFGE was not a top-down organization. It was created and driven from the local exchanges upwards to the district and central levels. Paid professionals were certainly on staff, but profits or dividends were realized at the local level. If the Fruit Exchange Supply Company lowered its costs in making box shook, those savings were passed on to the locally owned packinghouses, which in turn

---

[13] Grace H. Larsen, "Commentary: The Economics and Structure of the Citrus Industry: Comment on Papers by H. Vincent Moses and Ronald Tobey and Charles Wetherell," *California History* 74, no. 1(Spring 1995): 38-45.

meant that the packing charges for Clifford Pitzer's latest shipment out of Claremont would be lowered, and his profit increased.

Decadence of The Industry

The citrus industry in Southern California was either in decline or very close to that point, just before the outbreak of World War II. Economic depressions, great or otherwise, tend to freeze people in place. No one wants trouble at work, because there is a long line of the unemployed, ready to fill their spot. Businessmen don't expand operations, and banks are loath to risk the money anyway. The second generation of Mexican immigrants did not want citrus to be the only career option; before World War II, there were few alternatives. Grower Ben Osbun saw that increased labor costs were going to begin to "eat into" profits to the point that a small grower would contemplate selling out to a large one. Osbun felt that that time had arrived just before America's entry into the war.[14]

The economic recovery that started during the war, and the post-war boom, brought automobiles and freeways to

---

[14] Ben Osbun, interviewed by Mary Dalton on November 30, 1989, Redlands, California. Vol. 35 "Citrus and Service" Redlands Centennial Oral History Project, A.K.Smiley Public Library.

Southern California, and the resultant smog that began to have a negative impact on the fruit. As early as 1964, Clifford Pitzer thought that all the groves in the Claremont-Pomona area would be gone within five years, due to smog, theft, operating costs, and high land prices.[15]

A more telling example of industry decadence was the purchase of small groves by absentee owners who had no interest in being a citrus rancher. The grove only had value as a tax shelter. The trees could be depreciated, and operating costs deducted. Citrus cultivation is a vocation. The trees take constant care and protection from pests. If some growers spray to protect their trees from one of the many scale insects that attack citrus, but a significant number do not spray, untreated trees can cause a re-infestation of the groves of the more diligent growers.

The war gave impetus to the forces that relentlessly chipped away at acreage in the old citrus belt; it also opened the door to opportunity for many Mexican Americans, especially the rising second generation that wanted more than picking oranges and lighting smudge pots. For many,

---

[15] Clifford B. Pitzer, interviewed by Caroline Beatty and Enid Douglass on December 11, 1964, Claremont, California. Claremont Graduate School Oral History Program.

wartime service meant educational opportunities. Others landed better paying jobs in new industries like aerospace, or the Kaiser Steel plant in Fontana. Mexican American women became the predominant workers in the packinghouses, but also found work at nearby Norton Air Force Base. They too achieved a small piece of the American Dream.

A Greater Community

Finally, as the old growers retired or passed on, and as the groves one by one were turned to homes, schools and shopping centers, almost all that are left are memories and vestiges of the past glory of an empire of citrus that stretched from Pasadena to Redlands. Separate communities of growers and pickers no longer exist. When Redlands High School plays its archrival Redlands East Valley High in football, the prize is a trophy known as "the smudge pot." It is likely that players on both sides have roots in local citrus groves.

The institutions that were founded by the wealth of the grower elite, such as the Smiley Library or the Summer Music Festival at the Redlands Bowl, were institutions that once helped to create community for the growers, but which today provide common ground, where class lines become less

recognizable. The broad, horizontal comradeship of imagined communities becomes real, if only for a little while. The grandchildren of the citrus growers and the citrus workers read together in the library and are likely sitting side-by-side in the audience at "The Bowl." Community is tangible in these common spaces today. Economic, social, and ethnic divisions that were once inherent in Redlands and other towns of the old citrus belt, were broken down by assertive members of the Mexican American community and by fair minded members of the "Anglo" community, in order to foster the formation of a greater community.

The towns that were created by the citrus industry live on, with diversified economies, and some of them have managed to save small enclaves of citrus groves, so that the heritage is not forgotten. Standing alongside a citrus grove today, it is easy to imagine little Eunice Romero "running through the groves barefooted, and wading in the water of the 'Sankee,' and of course, eating the fruit, which was supreme, because my Dad was a good orange grower."[16]

---

[16] Eunice Romero Gonzalez, interviewed by Robert Gonzalez July 8, 1994 Redlands, California. Vol. 8 "Citrus and Community in the East San Bernardino Valley" A.K. Smiley Public Library.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Oral Histories

"Citrus and Service" Redlands Centennial Oral History Project, A.K. Smiley Public Library, Redlands, California.

"Citrus, Labor and Community in the East San Bernardino Valley" A.K. Smiley Public Library, Redlands, California.

Claremont Graduate School Oral History Program, Claremont, California.

Corona Public Library Oral History Project, Corona, California.

Archives and Collections

Redlands Chamber of Commerce Collection, The Heritage Room, A.K. Smiley Public Library, Redlands, California.

Redlands-Highland Fruit Exchange Annual Reports, 1931-1938, A.K. Smiley Public Library, Redlands, California.

Orange Heights Orange Association Collection, W.D. Addison Heritage Room, Corona Public Library, Corona, California.

Queen Colony Fruit Exchange Collection, W.D. Addison Heritage Room, Corona Public Library, Corona, California.

R.H. Verity, Sons and Company Collection, W.D. Addison Heritage Room, Corona Public Library, Corona, California.

Newspapers and Periodicals

California Citrograph (California Fruit Growers Exchange)

Citrus Leaves (Mutual Orange Distributors)

Corona Daily Independent

Redlands Daily Facts

Riverside Daily Press

Riverside Enterprise

San Bernardino Sun

Santa Ana Weekly Blade

Sunset

The Nation

Government Documents

State of California. *An Act for the Government and Protection of Indians*, Chapter 133, *Statutes of California*, April 22, 1850; Chapter 231, *Statutes of California*, April 8, 1860.

National Labor Relations Board." *In The Matter of North Whittier Heights Citrus Association and Citrus Packing House Workers Union No. 21091,"* Case No. C-310 Vol. 10, no. 113, 1269-1298.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. Fifteenth Census of the United States. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1932.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. Fifteenth Census of the United States: 1930. *Abstract of the Fifteenth Census of the United States*. Washington: U.S. Govt. Printing Office, 1933.

U.S. Department of Agriculture. Agricultural Adjustment Administration, *The Citrus Program Under the Agricultural Adjustment Administration*, by E.W. Braun Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1934.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service, California Wheat, 1866-2011, Revised March 2012.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Agricultural Statistics Service, California Oranges, 1920-2010, Revised February 2011.

U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Adjustment Administration, *Agricultural Adjustment: A Report of Administration of the Agricultural Adjustment Act May 1933 to February 1934*. Washington, D.C.: 1934.

Secondary Sources

Books

Alamillo, Jose M. *Making Lemonade Out of Lemons: Mexican American Labor and Leisure in a California Town, 1880-1960*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2006.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. rev. ed. London: Verson, 1991.

Arax, Mark and Rick Wartzman. *The King of California: J.G. Boswell and the Making of a Secret American Empire*. New York: Public Affairs, 2003.

Boyd, James, and John Brown Jr., eds. *History of San Bernardino and Riverside Counties*. Madison, Wisconsin: Lewis Publishing, 1922.

Burgess, Larry E. *Alfred Albert and Daniel Smiley: A Biography*. Redlands, CA: Beacon Printery, 1969.

Chan, Sucheng. *This Bittersweet Soil: The Chinese in California Agriculture, 1860-1910*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.

Daniel, Cletus E. *Bitter Harvest: A History of California Farmworkers, 1870-1941*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981.

Garcia, Mario T. *Desert Immigrants: The Mexicans of El Paso, 1880-1920*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981.

Garcia, Matt. *A World of its Own: Race, Labor and Citrus in the Making of Greater Los Angeles, 1900-1970*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2001.

Gonzalez, Gilbert G. *Labor and Community: Mexican Citrus Worker Villages in a Southern California County, 1900-1950.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994.

Hartig, Anthea Marie. "Citrus Growers and the Construction of the Southern California Landscape, 1880-1940" PhD diss., University of California Riverside, 2001.

Heizer, Robert, ed. *The Destruction of California Indians: a collection of documents from the period 1847-1865, in which are described some of the things that happened to some of the Indians of California.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1993.

Irshay, Phyllis C. *The Pride and Glory of the Town: The Story of the A.K. Smiley Public Library.* Redlands, CA: City of Redlands, 1988.

Kelley, Robin D. G. *Hammer and Hoe: Alabama Communists During The Great Depression.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990.

Laszlo, Pierre. *Citrus: A History.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Leuchtenburg, William E. *Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal, 1932-1940.* New York: Harper & Row, 1963.

MacCurdy, Rahno Mabel, V.A. Lockebey. *Selling The Gold: History of Sunkist and Pure Gold.* Upland, CA: The Upland Public Library Foundation, 1999.

McWilliams, Carey. *Factories In The Field.* Santa Barbara: Peregrine Publishers, 1971.

Ngai, Mae M. *Impossible Subjects: Illegal Aliens and the Making of Modern America.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.

Olmstead, Alan L. and Paul W. Rhode. "The Evolution of California Agriculture, 1850-2000." In *California Agriculture: Dimensions and Issues*, edited by Jerome B. Siebert 1-28. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004.

Patterson, Tom. *A Colony for California: Riverside's First Hundred Years,* 2nd ed. Riverside, CA: Riverside Museum Press, 1996.

Reuther, Walter, Herbert John Webber, Leon Dexter Batchelor, eds. *The Citrus Industry, Vol. 1: History, World Distribution, Botany and Varieties* Rev.ed. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.

Ruiz, Vicki L. *From Out of the Shadows: Mexican Women in Twentieth Century America.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Scheuring, Ann Foley. *"A Sustaining Comradeship": the Story of University of California Cooperative Extension, 1913-1988: a Brief History Prepared for UCCE's 75th Anniversary.* Berkeley, Calif: Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources, University of California, 1988.

Starr, Kevin. *Inventing The Dream: California Through the Progressive Era.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.

Starr, Kevin. *Endangered Dreams: The Great Depression in California.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Stein, Walter. *California and the Dust Bowl Migration.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1973.

Teague, Charles C. *Fifty Years A Rancher.* Los Angeles: Anderson & Ritchie, The Ward Ritchie Press, 1944.

Teague, Charles C. "Making Proration Work." In *10 Talks on Citrus Marketing.* Los Angeles, 1939.

Teague, Charles C. "The Need For Orderly Distribution." In *10 Talks on Citrus Marketing.* Los Angeles, 1939.

Trafzer, Clifford E. and Joel R. Hyer, eds. *Exterminate Them!: Written Accounts of the Murder, Rape, and Enslavement of Native Americans during the California Gold Rush.* East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1999.

Vaught, David. *Cultivating California: Growers, Specialty Crops, and Labor, 1875-1920.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1999.

Watkins, T.H. *The Hungry Years: A Narrative History of the Great Depression In America*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1999.

Webber, Herbert John and others. "A Study of the Effects of Freezes on Citrus in California," *College of Agriculture, Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin no. 304* (January 1919): 247-275.

Weber, Devra. *Dark Sweat, White Gold: California Farm Workers, Cotton, and the New Deal*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

Zamora, Emilio. *The World of the Mexican Worker in Texas*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 1993.

Articles

Belknap, Michael R. "The Era of the Lemon: A History of Santa Paula, California." *California Historical Society Quarterly* 47, no.2 (June, 1968): 113-140.

Gerber, James. "The Origin of California's Export Surplus in Cereals." *Agricultural History* 67, no. 4 (Autumn, 1993): 51-57.

Gerber, James. "The Gold Rush Origins of California's Wheat Economy." *America Latina En La Historia Economica, Boletin De Fuentes* 34 (December, 2010): 35-44.

Gonzalez, Gilbert G. "Labor and Community: The Camps of Mexican Citrus Pickers in Southern California." *Western Historical Quarterly* 22, no. 3 (August, 1991): 289-312.

Gonzalez, Gilbert G. "The Mexican Citrus Picker Union, the Mexican Consulate, and the Orange County Strike of 1936." *Labor History* 35, no.1 (Winter, 1994): 48-65.

Gilbert G. Gonzalez, "Women, Work, and Community in the Mexican Colonias of the Southern California Citrus Belt." *California History* 74, no. 1, Citriculture and Southern California (Spring, 1995): 58-67.

Hartig, Anthea M. "In a World He Has Created: Class Collectivity and the Growers' Landscape of the Southern California Citrus Industry, 1890-1940." *California History* 74, no. 1 (Spring 1995): 100-111.

Hise, Greg. "From Roadside Camps to Garden Homes: Housing and Community Planning for California's Migrant Work Force, 1935-1941." *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture* 5 (1995): 243-258.

Hoffman, Abraham. "Mexican Repatriation Statistics: Some Suggested Alternatives to Carey McWilliams." *Western Historical Quarterly* 3, no. 4 (Oct., 1972): 391-404.

Hoffman, Abraham. "Stimulus to Repatriation: The 1931 Federal Deportation Drive and the Los Angeles Mexican Community," *Pacific Historical Review* 42, no. 2 (May, 1973): 205-219.

Isaac, Erich. "Influence of Religion on the Spread of Citrus." *Science* 129, no. 3343 (Jan. 23, 1959): 179-186.

Johnston, J.C. "Citrus Freeze Damage: Possible Effect of the January 1949 Cold Spell on the 1950 Crop and Recommended Treatment of the Injured Trees." *California Agriculture* (April 1949): 5-6.

Larsen, Grace H. "Commentary: The Economics and Structure of the Citrus Industry: Comment on Papers by H. Vincent Moses and Ronald Tobey and Charles Wetherell." *California History* 74, no. 1(Spring 1995): 38-45.

Larsen, Grace and H.E. Erdman, "Development of Revolving Finance in Sunkist Growers." *Journal of Farm Economics* 41, no. 4 (November 1959): 769-780.

McBane, Margo. "The Role of Gender in Citrus Employment: A Case Study of Recruitment, Labor, and Housing Patterns at the Limoneira Company, 1893 to 1940." *California History* 74, no. 1, Citriculture and Southern California (Spring, 1995): 68-81.

Moses, H.Vincent. "'The Orange-Grower Is Not a Farmer': G. Harold Powell, Riverside Orchardists, and the Coming of Industrial Agriculture, 1893-1930." *California History* 74, no. 1(Spring, 1995): 22-37.

Pichardo, Nelson A. "The Power Elite and Elite-Driven Countermovements: The Associated Farmers of California during the 1930s." *Sociological Forum* 10, no.1 (March 1995): 21-49.

Rhode, Paul W. "Learning, Capital Accumulation, and the Transformation of California Agriculture." *Journal of Economic History* 55, no. 4 (Dec., 1995): 773-800.

Ricardo Romo, "Responses to Mexican Immigration, 1910-1930," *Aztlan: A Journal of Chicano Studies, UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center Press* 6, no.2 (Summer 1975): 172-194.

Ryerson, Knowles A. "History and Significance of the Foreign Plant Introduction Work of the United States Department of Agriculture." *Agricultural History* 7, no. 3 (July 1933): 110-128.

Sackman, Douglas Cazaux. "'By Their Fruits Ye Shall Know Them': 'Nature Cross Culture Hybridization' and the California Citrus Industry, 1893-1939." *California History* 74, no. 1 (Spring, 1995): 82-99.

Taylor, Paul S. "California Farm Labor: A Review." *Agricultural History* 42, no. 1 (Jan., 1968): 49-54.

Tobey, Ronald and Wetherell, Charles. "The Citrus Industry and the Revolution of Corporate Capitalism in Southern California, 1887-1944." *California History* 74, no.1 (Spring 1995): 6-21.

Woehlke, Walter V. "In The Orange Country: Where the Orchard is a Mine, the Human factor Among Gold-Bearing Trees of California." *Sunset 26,* no. 3 (March 1911): 251-264.